DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 178 EC 111 521

AUTHOR	Cegelka, Patricia Thomas; And Others
TITLE	Career Education Programming for the Handicapped: Cooperative Personnel Preparation. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Kentucky Univ., Lexington. Div. of Vocational Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.
PUB DATE	78
GRANT	G007500459
NOTE	225p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$11.37 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; *Conference Reports; Employment; *Federal Legislation; *Handicapped Children; Individualized Programs; *Teacher Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

The report contains 11 presentations from a 1977 conference on the vocational preparation stage of career education for handicapped children. K. Hoyt, M. Appel, and L. Phelps review implications of career education for special education, vocational education, and teacher education. L. Phelps presents an overview of federal commitments to vocational education and employment of the handicapped. Legal implications for State Departments of Education are analyzed be R. Chenowith, while the local school perspective on P.L. 94-142 (the Education for All Handicapped Children Act) is set forth by H. Collela. M. Phillips reviews the mandate for individualized education programs and includes examples of total service and individual intervention plans. M. Gold discusses vocational preparation services for adolescents with severe multiple handicaps. Two separate state reports from a 1976 Illinois conference on special education/vocational education are provided. In a final paper, G. Meers and S. Vasa describe Nebraska's project to develop competencies for special vocational needs teachers. Also included is conference-related information, including a followup evaluation. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161178

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING
FOR THE HANDICAPPED:
COOPERATIVE PERSONNEL PREPARATION

FINAL REPORT

by

Patricia Thomas Cegelka

Clayton P. Omvig

Michael L. McKernan

National Workshop on Career Education Programming for the Handicapped:

Cooperative Personnel Preparation

March 15-18, 1977

Department of Special Education

Department of Vocational Education

University of Kentucky

Lexington, Kentucky

Spring, 1978

EC111521

The report presented herein was prepared pursuant to Grant Number G00-7500-459, Division of Personnel Preparation of the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped. However, the information presented herein does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of either the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

PREFACE

Philosophical and legislative mandates have made the expanded provision of vocational preparation programs for special education students a priority program area in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, as well as the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation. Predictions that as many as one million handicapped youth (or two out of every five leaving the schools) will be underemployed by 1977, with another three-quarters of a million unemployed, have emphasized the need for additional and more effective program efforts (Barone, 1973).

DeMond (1969) suggested that before significant improvement in programming can occur, the efforts of personnel in Special Education, Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation must be coordinated. DeMond uses the term "synergism", meaning that the simultaneous action of separate agencies should have greater impact than the total effort of each separately, to describe the direction these agencies must follow if they are to be truly effective in meeting the vocational needs of the handicapped. Klinkhamer (1972) also has stressed the need for cooperative planning among the three agencies if "full services" are to be provided.

The Education Amendments of 1974 have declared it "the obligation of each State and local educational agency to provide such preparation for all its children and youth, including those who may be handicapped or educationally disadvantaged." The Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 asserted the right of every handicapped child to receive an appropriate educational program at public expense. Other legislative actions, such as the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, have prompted individuals in the fields of Special Education, Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation to enhance their efforts to provide the academic, vocational, and social training and other supportive services which the Handicapped need to become successfully employed.

The implications of these mandates for the redirection of university level personnel preparation programs are apparent. In 1976, the University of Illinois hosted two special education/vocational education workshops for university personnel preparation faculty and state department of education representatives. Subsequently, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped funded the University of Kentucky to host the National Conference on Cooperative Career Education Programming. Jointly sponsored by the Departments of Special Education and Vocational Education, this conference focused on the vocational preparation stage of career education. Thirty-two teams from various universities and/or university consortia were invited to participate on a fully reimbursed basis. Each team consisted of one special education faculty member and one vocational education faculty member. In addition, on a non-reimbursed basis, several teams also brought additional members . Several state department of education representatives attended and some universities and colleges sent single representatives. In all, 106 persons registered for the conference.

The purposes of the conference were (1) to encourage cooperative planning and programming among vocational and special education, and (2) to present models of exemplary career preparation programs for the handicapped. The participants engaged in the following activities:

1. Study of the implications of congressional legislative mandates for expanded and improved career programming for the

handicapped and review the resources available for carrying out these mandates.

2. Exploration of the implications of The Education For All Handicapped Children Act to cooperative programming efforts.

3. Dialogue with other professional teacher educators as well as USOE representatives relative to the directions of cooperative career education programming for the handicapped. Specifically, the participants (a) addressed the questions of how the educational system can meet these mandates and (b) targeted teacher roles and service delivery systems that could evolve.

4. Refinement of their own institutional plans based on conference outcomes and inter-institutional feedback.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

PROGRAM 1

Conference Purpose 3

Conference Agenda 4

Steering Committee Roster 9

PRESENTATIONS 10

"Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education" by Kenneth B. Hoyt 11

"In Response to Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education" by Melville Appel. 21

"In Response to Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education" by L. Allen Phelps 25

"An Overview of the Expanding Federal Commitments to Vocational Education and Employment of Handicapped Individuals" by L. Allen Phelps 27

"Discussion Regarding The New Arena" by Robert Chenowith . . . 44

"Implications of PL 94-142: The Local School Perspective" by Henry V. Collela 52

"Individualized Education Programs" by Misha Phillips 61

"Providing Vocational Preparation Programs for Adolescents With Severe Multiple Handicaps" by Marc Gold 81

"From There to Here: Florida Team Report from the Illinois Conference" by Pat Gardiner 96

"From There to Here: Texas Team Report from the Illinois Conference" by Linda Parrish and Mark Hull 100

"Special Vocational Needs Teacher Competency and Endorsement: The Nebraska Case" by Gary Meers and Stanley F. Vasa 105

REACTION TEAM WORKSHOPS AND ACTIVITIES 122

CONFERENCE EVALUATION 139

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION 143

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 153

APPENDIX 162

- A) Reaction Team Assignments 162
- B) Reaction Team Workshop and Activity Forms 164
- C) Conference Evaluation Form 175
- D) Conference Evaluation Comments 178
- E) Team Follow-Up Questionnaire 186
- F) Team Follow-Up Questionnaire Comments 194

PROGRAM

The following pages contain the conference program. The aspects of the program as presented are the conference purpose, agenda, and steering committee.

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING FOR THE·HADICAPPED: COOPERATIVE PERSONNEL PREPARATION

CONFERENCE DIRECTORS:

Dr. Patricia Thomas Cegelka
Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

Dr. Clayton P. Omvig
Associate Professor
Department of Vocational Education
University of Kentucky

CONFERENCE COORDINATOR:

Patricia M. Hoessli
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

MONOGRAPH COORDINATOR:

Michael L. McKernan
Doctoral Student
Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

National Conference on Career Education Programming for the Handicapped: Cooperative Personnel Preparation

Both philosophical and legislative mandates have made the expanded provision of career preparation programs for handicapped students a priority program area in the fields of special education and vocational education. The implications of these mandates for the redirection of college and university personnel training programs are apparent. The purpose of this conference is to bring together U.S.O.E. personnel, state departments of education representatives, special educators, and vocational educators to discuss the interface between the two disciplines in the preparation of personnel for secondary programs. The participants at the conference will engage in the following activities:

1. Study the implications of congressional legislative mandates for expanded and improved career programming for the handicapped and review the resources available for carrying out these mandates.
2. Explore and reflect upon the new arena in which education finds itself in relation to providing appropriate educational opportunities for handicapped students via an Individual Educational Plan (IEP), including what the IEP should include, who should prepare it, and what cooperative efforts are necessary for implementation of the plan.
3. Engage in dialogue with other professional teacher educators as well as U.S.O.E. representatives relative to the directions of cooperative career education programming for the handicapped. Specifically, the participants will address the questions of how the educational system can meet these mandates and identify the end products, both in terms of teacher roles and service delivery systems targeted.
4. Reflect on the outcomes of the 1975 and 1976 Illinois conferences on special needs vocational teacher education. A general overview of the conferences will be presented, followed by discussions focusing on personnel preparation plans and other recommendations coming out of the conferences.
5. Refine their own institutional plans bases on conference outcomes and inter-institutional feedback.

CAREER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING FOR THE HANDICAPPED: COOPERATIVE PERSONNEL PREPARATION

TUESDAY, MARCH 15

5:30 - 7:00 Registration . . . . North Colonial Hall

7:00 - 9:30 Dinner

Chairpersons:
Dr. Patricia T. Cegelka, Associate Professor
Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

Dr. Clayton P. Omvig, Associate Professor
Department of Vocational Education
University of Kentucky

Welcome:
Dr. A. Edward Blackhurst, Chairman
Department of Special Education
University of Kentucky

Speaker Introduction:

Dr. Harold Binkley, Chairman
Department of Vocational Education
University of Kentucky

Keynote Address:

"Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education"

Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education

Respondents:
Mr. Melville Appell, Project Officer
Division of Innovation and Research
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
United States Office of Education

Dr. Al Phelps
Vocational Industrial Education
Pennsylvania State University

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16

8:00 - 8:30 Additional Registration . . . . North Colonial Hall

8:00 - 8:30 Coffee and Doughnuts . . . . North Colonial Hall

8:30 - 8:50 Conference Overview . . . . North Colonial Hall

8:50 - 10:00 "The New Arena: Legislative Mandates and Legal Implications"

Dr. Al Phelps
Vocational Industrial Education
Pennsylvania State University

Mr. Robert Chenoweth
Assistant Attorney General
Commonwealth of Kentucky

Questions and Discussion

10:00 - 10:15 Break

10:15 - 10:45 "Implications of the New Arena: The Local School Perspective"

Dr. Henry Colella, Assistant Superintendent
Division of Special Education
Nassau County Public Schools
Westbury, New York

10:45 - 11:45 "Individualized Education Plans"

Ms. Misha Phillips, Director
Child Service Demonstration Center
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children
Kentucky State Department of Education

Mrs. Carrie Ott, Consultant
Division of Mental Retardation
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children
Kentucky State Department of Education

12:00 - 1:00 Buffet Lunch . . . . Center Colonial Hall

1:30 - 3:00	"Providing Vocational Preparation Programs for Adolescents with Severe Multiple Handicaps"	North Colonial Hall
	Dr. Marc Gold, Research Associate Professor Institute for Child Behavior and Development University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	
3:00 - 3:15	Break	
3:15 - 3:30	Overview of Work Groups	North Colonial Hall
3:30 - 5:00	Workshop 1	
	Group 1	North Colonial Hall
	Group 2	North Colonial Hall
	Group 3	Magnolia Room
	Group 4	Small South Colonial Hall
	Group 5	Turf Room
5:30 - 6:30	Social Hour (Cash Bar)	Center Colonial Hall
6:30 - 7:45	Buffet	Center Colonial Hall
8:00 - 9:30	Evening Sessions (choice of sessions)	
	1. Film Theatre: "Try Another Way".	North Colonial Hall
	2. "A Free Appropriate Public Education for All Handicapped Children": Introduction to PL 94-142, developed by the Council for Exceptional Children for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped	Magnolia Room
	3. Certification Programs for Secondary Level Teachers of Special Needs Students.	Center Colonial Hall
	4. Federal Priorities in Funding for Career Education.	Small South Colonial Hall
	Mr. Melville Appell Dr. Al Phelps	
	DCD and AVA Special Needs Membership Tables	Entrance, North Colonial Hall

8:00 - 8:30 Coffee and Doughnuts . . . . North Colonial Hall

8:30 - 9:00 Synthesis from Workshop I . . . . North Colonial Hall

9:00 - 10:30 "From There to Here": Team Reports from the Illinois Conferences . . . . North Colonial Hall

Florida (consortium)

Dr. James Hensel, Professor and Chairman
Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education
College of Education
University of Florida

Mr. Pat Gardiner
Florida Learning Resource Center
Ocala, Florida

Texas (single institution)

Dr. Mark Hull, Research Associate
Center for Career Development
College of Education
Texas A & M

Ms. Linda Parrish, Research Associate
Center for Professional Development
College of Education
Texas A & M

Nebraska (state department certification)

Dr. Gary Meers, Director
Special Vocational Needs Programs
University of Nebraska

Dr. Stanley F. Vasa
Associate Professor of Special Education
Teachers College
University of Nebraska

10:30 - 10:45 Break

10:45 - 12:00 Workshop II

Group 1 . . . . North Colonial Hall

Group 2 . . . . North Colonial Hall

Group 3 . . . . Magnolia Room

	Group 4	Small South Colonial Hall
	Group 5	Turf Room
12:00 - 1:00	Buffet Lunch	Center Colonial Hall
1:15 - 4:00	Workshop III	
	Group 1	North Colonial Hall
	Group 2	North Colonial Hall
	Group 3	Magnolia Room
	Group 4	Small South Colonial Hall
	Group 5	Turf Room
4:00 - 5:00	Institutional Team Planning	
5:00 - 6:00	Social Hour (Cash Bar)	Center Colonial Hall

FRIDAY, MARCH 18

8:00 - 8:15	Coffee and Doughnuts	North Colonial Hall
8:15 - 8:45	Reaction Team Assignment	North Colonial Hall
8:45 - 9:45	Reaction Teams: Critique of Institutional Plans	
	Teams 1 and 2	North Colonial Hall
	Teams 3 and 4	Center Colonial Hall
	Team 5	Small South Colonial Hall
9:45 - 10:30	Reports of Reaction Teams	North Colonial Hall
10:30 - 11:30	Wrap-up and Conference Evaluation	North Colonial Hall

Steering Committee Roster

National Component

Mr. Len Albright, Doctoral Student, and Coordinator, Illinois National Workshop on Career Education, University of Illinois

Mr. Melville Appell, Project Officer, Division of Innovation and Research, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education

Miss Martha Bokee, Project Officer, Vocational and Career Education, Division of Personnel Preparation, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education

Dr. Donn Brolin, President, Division on Career Development, Council for Exceptional Children, and Professor, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services, University of Missouri

Dr. Gary Clark, Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Kansas

Ms. Charlotte Conaway, Specialist, Special Vocational Education Programs, Maryland State Department of Education

Dr. William Halloran, State Plan Officer, Aid to States Branch, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, United States Office of Education

Dr. Al Phelps, Vocational Industrial Education, Pennsylvania State University

Ms. Glee Saunders, Project Specialist, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, United States Office of Education

Local/Regional Component

Dr. Dwight Auvenshine, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, University of Kentucky

Dr. Harold Binkley, Chairman, Department of Vocational Education, University of Kentucky

Dr. Edward Blackhurst, Chairman, Department of Special Education, University of Kentucky

Dr. Stella Edwards, Assistant Superintendent, Kentucky Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children

Ms. Donnalie Stratton, Director, Special Vocational Functions Unit, Kentucky Bureau of Vocational Education

PRESENTATIONS

The following pages contain the major presentaions which were delivered during the conference. The presentations were directed to the following areas:

a) Cooperative personnel preparation

b) Law and legal implications

c) Individualized educational plans

d) Vocational preparation and severe handicaps

e) Team reports from the Illinois Conference

Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education

Kenneth B. Hoyt
Director, Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education

As all of you know, career education is not a new kind of program. And we don't want it to be. We're not a new kind of curriculum. And we don't want to be. We're not looking for a new kind of person. We're looking for the people who are right here in this room. And that's the way it's going to go. We are a people-change effort, not a program-add-on effort. We are a people-change effort that says it is time, and it is passed time, to refocus the entire system of American education. From kindergarten through the graduate school a more appropriate emphasis must be brought to one of education's goals, the goal of preparation for work, We seek to do this without demeaning or detracting from any other worthy goal that American education has always had and must still maintain. We seek only a proper emphasis on one of education's goals - the goal of education as preparation for work.

Now, obviously today we are faced with some serious problems in relation to work. There just aren't enough jobs for everyone and a lot of people don't have the skills to handle the jobs that are available. The problem is, in part, that the days are passed when just a basic education and a desire to work is going to ensure a job. And whether that education is a high school diploma, junior college associate degree, or a degree from the great University of Kentucky, it won't get you a job if you don't have skills. Now that, I think is the bedrock reason for talking about joint career education for special education kids. That's the bedrock reason, in my opinion, for having a conference that brings special education and vocational education people together. We're talking about providing vocational skills to handicapped persons that will let them get into the labor market. All the talk about how they get along after they get in is just rhetoric. Because you can't get along if you can't get in. The first job is to get in. If you're going to get in, you've got to have some skills. This is what we mean when we talk about education as preparation for work. The provision of vocational skills required for entry into the labor market is one of the major contributions that American education can and should and must make to the province of youth unemployment. Whether those skills are learned at the high school level, post-high school/sub-baccalureate level, baccalaureate level or the graduate school level, they must be included somewhere. Before they leave the education system for the world of work they're going to have to have a set of vocational skills. At high school level, we call it vocational education. At the post-high school level we call it occupational education. The baccalaureate level is called professional specialization. It's a way of getting into the labor market. To whatever extent that is the problem, then what is needed is vocational education, occupational education, professional specialization.

That is not all of the problem. When you look at the total problem of youth unemployment or adult unemployment, at the whole non-employment picture in this nation today, when you think about education as preparaion for work, you have to look beyond the vocational skills required for entry into the labor market. And I say that many kids are having problems in the labor market today because they can't read, or they can't do basic math, or they are lacking in self-understanding, or they don't have understanding of educational occupational opportunities, or they lack a basic desire to work.

The answer to all of these problems is career education.

Now I have purposely started this way because we have vocational education and special education together. I would like you to understand why I am doing it the way I'm doing it. Education as preparation for work can be separated into two components: (1) the specific vocational skills required for entry into the labor market; and (2) the adaptability skills required to get along in the labor market. The first is vocational education, in part, and the second is career education. The point I want to start with is that I do not want any vocational educator to think that he's only involved in one part. The problem we have is that vocational education is involved in career education. Every part of career education. And has been all the time. The problem is how do we get the rest of the school staff and the rest of the community involved in career education. Vocational education will do its part on specific vocational skill training and vocational education has done its part, and continues to do its part, on the other broad aspects of career education until we get all the rest involved. But career education is broader than vocational education. When we talk about special education and career education now, we've got to talk about the whole gambit. We're talking about refocusing American education.

I'd like to comment very briefly on what this refocusing effort consists of. It is not true, as many people claim, that career education can't be defined. Career education is going to be defined operationally by what we say we're doing when we say we are refocusing American education. There are many ways in which career education is trying to refocus American education, each of which requires the involvement of special education people and vocational education people with all kids, including handicapped kids. In a generic sense, we're talking about career education being concerned with adaptability skills, with skills required to adjust to changes.

A very important aspect of these refocusing efforts has to do with basic academic skills. Career education is a vehicle for getting back to basics. When we talk about this emphasis in career education we're talking about something beginning at a very early elementary level. That's part of the message I really feel obligated to give to special education people and vocational education people. Your responsibilities, all of our responsibilities, in career education do not begin in the high school. Rather, we're talking about the whole educational process from elementary school on, talking about refocusing the teaching/learning process. The one thing we're trying to do in every classroom is to focus on the meaningfulness or purpose of each day. We must focus on the importance of this lesson in this room at this time. Our problem is the school doesn't make sense to kids. Well the real problem is that it doesn't make sense to a lot of teachers either. It's not just the kids that don't know why they're there. It's the teacher, also, who too frequently doesn't seem to know why it is important to study a particular subject. Career education is a vehicle for relevancy. One of the reasons that can be given for learning a particular task is that people use it in their work. But we never say that's the only reason. We never say it's the most important reason. We do say it is one reason. It's a way you can answer it, even for little kids, that they can understand something about why they are learning a particular skill. The child ought to be able to use the skill this afternoon, next week, next month, next year, twenty years from now. The child needs to see that he will use it in many aspects of his life, including his work. This can motivate kids. Relevancy is one way to alter the teaching-learning process for special education kids, no matter what the handicap. We can tell the kids that people use these skills in their work and since they are going to be workers, they should have these skills.

Another thing we are going to try to do in the teaching-learning process in the name of career education is to emphasize in every classroom something that special education has been emphasizing for a good many years. That is an emphasis on success, an emphasis on accomplishment in the classroom. Too often we have seen the teaching-learning process oriented around failure rather than success. When kids get their papers back, usually the teacher has marked how many they missed, not how many they got right, but too frequently teachers fail to say you did this; they say these other kids did better. They don't say you accomplished this much; they say you've got this far to go.

What we're trying to do in career education is refocus the teaching-learning process, to establish a reward system for the work of the student, to reward students when they achieve. If I want people to want to work, I've got to reward them when they work. Every fall we get a whole generation of kindergarten kids that start out as real eager learners and before they hit the fourth grade they are all turned off by school. I'm convinced the reason a whole lot of them are turned off is that we have not rewarded their attempts to achieve. We have not rewarded them when they have accomplished something. Instead, we have emphasized how far they've still got to go. We need to put a success emphasis into the classroom That's what we're trying to do in career education.

The third thing we're trying to do in the teaching/learning process is utilize all of the community resources for learning that are in every community in this nation. It's time we quit trying to do it all by ourselves. It's time to quit trying to simulate the community in the school when you can't do it. The community offers a whole lot of people and a whole lot of resources. You've got some people in every community that didn't go to the school of hard books like we did. They went through the school of hard knocks. They learned some things that some of our boys and girls need to know today. And they are available and willing to help.

We've got resources in that world of work that haven't been utilized and need to be utilized. If we utilize them, if we recognize them, kids can learn in more ways than just through books. They can learn, and do learn, in more places than just the classroom. They can learn, and they do learn from people that are not certified teachers.

If we are concerned on how much they learn, not how much credit we get, we will take advantage of these resources. If we take advantage of these resources we're going to do another thing that's going to increase achievement. That is, we'll increase the variety in the classroom. If you want to increase productivity, increase variety. The Hawthorne experiment showed that when the room was made lighter, the productivity went up; when the room was made darker, the productivity went up. To change meant greater productivity. What we have done in these three basic changes in the teaching/learning process is take the three basic approaches to increasing productivity that have worked in American industry for fifty years and applied them to education. These three (1) make the task meaningful to the worker; (2) reward accomplishment; (3) increase variety in the workplace. I'm talking about challenge, and about adaptability skills.

There ought to be for all of us - vocational education, special education, all of education - a purposeful, conscious, prideful emphasis in the classroom on teaching kids basic good work habits. It's just that simple. Among the most basic things they have to acquire are the basic work habits of productivity. We've gotten away from these way too much. I think we've carried democracy in the classroom way too far. We've got too many teachers running around right now that are not doing kids a service. Teachers are becoming afraid of kids. One of the most basic things you have to learn is that there isn't any worker in the world that doesn't have a boss. Sometimes the situation is such that the reason you do a task is because the boss or teacher says so. That's why you do it. That's a very valuable lesson for kids to learn. I'm not talking about work values now. I'm talking about what makes the world go around. Just basic habit. I'm talking about encouraging kids to get to work on time, to come to school on time, to do the best they can, to finish the task they start, and to cooperate with their neighbors. These are not big, high-powered things. These are little things. These are habits that we can start building very early. If we were to give all of our special education kids basic good work habits, they'd be able to compete a whole lot better than many special education kids are competing now.

I'd like to think that we're also going to encourage self-understanding of kids through experience. You want to know if he's interested in being an auto mechanic? Give him a car and see if he can fix it. That will tell you more than any interest inventory you ever had. We're talking about kids finding out who they are and what they can do and what they're interested in by trying it. A lot of people today say kids don't want to work. I don't think kids have rejected work, I think the trouble is that a whole lot of kids just never heard of it. They never saw it, never smelled it, never felt it, never did it. We've got to let them try it if we want them to enjoy it. I've said it many times - reading about work is like reading about sex. I think that's true. It may be stimulating but it's very seldom very satisfying. If you want to know what it's like, you almost have to experience it. I think you have to experience work, I think that's the best way to get self-understanding. I think we emphasize this in a big way, and beginning very, very early. We're not talking about locking kids in. We're talking about opening things up. We need to get on with the job of teaching all kids job-seeking, job-getting, job-holding skills. Data from the National Association of the National Assessment/Educational Progress indicates that, of a group of 35 year-olds, 80% of them can fill out a job resume, but 55% of the ones filling out the job resume forgot to put their return address on it. Nobody could hire them if they couldn't be found. Now, we ought to be able to teach kids to put their return addresses on job application blanks. These aren't things EMR kids can't learn. They can learn them very well.

Special education kids also have to be taught career decision making skills. Career decision making skills are not that hard to learn. Something we've just got to face up to is that one of the greatest certainties is that of rapid change. The days are past when a kid can go into any program, choose an occupation, enter it, and stay in it until retirement. That's not the case anymore. The job market is changing too fast.

I think we all have a very holy crusade in which to engage. That's the crusade to reduce stereotyping as a deterant to full freedom of occupational choice. I'm talking about stereotyping with respect to handicapped persons, to race, and to sex. We still have people in this country that believe that the very best educational and occupational opportunities in this land ought to be reserved for able-bodied white males. Our culture has said differently for a good many years. But we know better and we can do better.

Kids with nothing to do very seldom do anything. We've given too many kids nothing to do and then complain about what they've found to do. Part of what they can find to do is productive work. The concept of work is not limited to the world of paid employment. There are all sorts of things that kids can do to make productive use of leisure time. Education as a preparation for work has got to include a very strong emphasis in this area. Anybody that is in special education and isn't concerned with career education including productive use of leisure time is missing a very important point.

And finally, I've got to discuss basically what we're all about, what career education is all about. We're going to talk about a refocusing effort. We're going to talk about it for what it is. Career education has one basic four-letter word that is at the bedrock of the whole concept. That word is called work. We make no bones about it. The word is not jobs. The word is work. It's a broader word than jobs. I think there are more people looking for jobs in this nation today than there are looking for work.

Our concern is with work. People ask what we are trying to do in career education. We want every individual in the United States of America to want to work - to get ready for work and to engage in work that is satisfying to himself and is also beneficial to society. When we talk about work we refer to it as a basic human need of all people. It's a need that everyone of us has. It's a special need, it seems to me, in special education. The need to do, the need to accomplish, the need to achieve, the need to be someone because I have done something. The need to know that it makes a difference that we exist - that because we exist, the world is in some small way, to some small degree, better off. It's a need we all have. It's a need that together we can help kids meet.

I am delighted to have had the opportunity to speak to this group - special education and vocational education joined together in a career education conference. I hope that everybody recognizes what a significant thing this is, to have this conference with career education in its title. It is through efforts such as this that we can expect to have the greatest impact on the career development of handicapped individuals.

28

In Response to "Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education"

Mr. Melville Appell, Project Officer
Division of Innovation and Research
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
United States Office of Education

It's quite difficult to focus on Dr. Hoyt's talk but there are some elements of it that are much more appropriate to special education than, shall I say, regular education.

He mentioned some of the attributes of education that are more important to special education, such as the most effective, productive use of one's time. In that context he mentioned leisure education. That's a very special and very important area. Because, as people, particularly the kids, enter and leave work they do develop vocational skills; not the hardest thing in the world to do. Particularly if what they are exposed to are menial tasks. I hope you and all of us get over that. But, in many instances that is the case. And the kids become discouraged just as the disadvantaged and they have no effective way to use leisure time. They cannot activate themselves in the community and when they fail, they go back up the hill. That is, as we used to say in Frankfort State Hospital and School, back to the institution. Too often that happens. Does anyone care or is it that all of us really only give lip service to the notion that the kids are worthwhile?

There are people right in this audience who have made some effort to see that doesn't happen. Take for instance Denny Vinton, who is a leisure expert and has a program with us in tourism, as well as a large and definitive camping program; Ed Blackhurst, with whom I used to work at Frankfort State Hospital and School; and some others of you - Henry Collela and Ken Hoyt here. All have been very effective in trying to make the best and most productive use of leisure time for the handicapped instead of keeping them entranced as prisoners of free time.

Further, in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, we have now engaged in a rather remarkable program, arts for the handicapped. This is a program calculated to give a measure of enjoyment to the kids. There is a National Committee, Arts for the Handicapped, associated with the National Endowment in the arts. If you read your Federal Register some years ago you would have found an article on creative arts. Bud Arberg, the Executive Director of the Arts Staff in the Office of Education, was the author and we are very fortunate to get involved in the financial picture through some insistence and a little vice-presidential pressure (on the distaff side) for special pupulations. Consequently, in the year 1977 there will be $250,000 from the National Endowment going to special populations, particularly the handicapped.

Also, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has a research project going in Washington with sites in Seattle and others to be chosen, in an effort to understand what infusion of the arts means in working with the handicapped in education. One might say "Why would anybody study that?" As somebody did say to me "Arts for the handicapped? Why, those kids in West Virginia are starving to death." "Well" I said, "there's another way to starve to death, too." You know you also have to feed the soul or good nutrition goes for naught.

Then we have what is now referred to as - I wonder if anybody has heard this term - lifelong learnings. What that really means is that we have handicapped people who don't make it out there in the community for one reason or another. And through lifelong learnings, what some people used to refer to as continuing education--the hancicapped people's needs are being met so that they are able to maintain themselves. Handicapped people get divorced too and they need marriage counseling, they need financial counseling, and retirement counseling. All these goodies that regular people have available to them in the community.

Now what we're going to do is develop lifelong learning managers so that handicapped people have a way of going to other people who understand, who can use guidance and metholology, and who will help them to survive in their communities.

Ken mentioned something about kids starting school and developing a negative response at about the fourth grade level. Well, that's very certainly true. There have been some early studies in that area. Some of these studies are very interesting. One of the things I remember is that while kids do develop these negative attitudes and desire to leave school at about the age of eleven, the first time they hit counseling - guidance, career or otherwise - is at the age of sixteen. That seems to be ridiculous. The situation cries out for early counseling in the elementary schools.

I guess I've been on this one for about twenty years and I can only remember two studies. Both made by a woman named Louise Eckerson, in a journal some years ago called Public Education. While I don't know if they were of great professional quality, they at least hit the mark. Nobody ever followed this up. I don't think I've ever seen a proposal - and I guess I've seen about four or five hundred proposals in the last couple of years - I don't think I've ever seen a proposal submitted to BEH on elementary guidance for handicapped people.

Ken in his usual, inimitable fashion, struck a respondent chord; the four letter word - work. The handicapped ask for that chance. They, above all, can only get that opportunity through being esposed to the various stages of career education, and I thank Ken Hoyt for bringing that to our attention in such a vigorous fashion.

In Response to Career Education: Implications for Special Education and Vocational Education and Teacher Education

L. Allen Phelps
Vocational Industrial Education
Pennsylvania State University

There is just one point that Dr. Hoyt made which I would like to reinforce. That is, distinguishing between "career education" and "vocational education" is extremely critical, largely because of the recency of the career education thrust. To some extent, it is my observation that, on this issue, educators have been somewhat like the youngster who lost his gum in the henhouse. We think we have found it about three different times. The first time we found career education we mistakenly called it vocational education. Then someone pointed out that vocational education has been here since 1917, so that couldn't be accurate. On the second occasion we thought it was all of education--that every educational or school experience was directly related to one's career development. After a period of time we decided that wasn't totally realistic. We are just now beginning to envision career education as education that relates to "preparation for work" -- a perspective and direction which Dr. Hoyt described eloquently for us.

In preparing educational personnel to serve handicapped youth, we must identify and build upon the concept of career education. Vocational educators have a critical role to play in the career development of all individuals, but the success of their efforts is dependent, to a large degree, upon the appropriateness of earlier career awareness, self-awareness, and career exploration experience. This conference affords all of us the unique opportunity to re-examine the total career development process and the criticality of that process for handicapped learners. The challenge of this conference will be to generate ideas and strategies that make the career development process "come alive" for those preservice and inservice teachers we seek to serve.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE EXPANDING FEDERAL COMMITMENTS TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS*

by

L. Allen Phelps
Vocational Industrial Education
Pennsylvania State University

Within the expanding national concerns for and commitments to education of the handicapped has emerged a concurrent commitment to vocational preparation, placement, and employment of the handicapped. These legislative and regulatory mandates have, like similar Congressional initiatives, resulted from a growing number of societal, constitutional, and legalistic concerns. Among the major concerns which have fostered Congressional action in this area are: high unemployment rates, underutilization of the handicapped workforce, discriminatory practices in employment of handicapped individuals, lack of appropriate occupational training opportunities, and occupational stereotyping.

This article will briefly discuss several of the existing conditions which call for reform in the nation's job preparation and employment practices relative to the handicapped. A major section will be devoted to an overview of four recent Federal initiatives which provide promise for implementing several of the needed reforms. Finally, the implications for future practice found in each of these initiatives will be discussed.

---

* This address presented by Dr. Phelps has since been published in the April, 1977 issue of Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded.

The Call for Reform in Education and Employment Practices

Probably the most logical and potent rationale for addressing the problems associated with education and employment of the handicapped is economical in nature. Maximization of human capital has been recognized as a critical factor in sustaining the nation's economic growth by a number of economists and educators. Concurrent with the emergence of the human movement has been the recognition that a substantial human capital resource, the handicapped, have been overlooked for several years. Because of their deviation from what is considered normal physical appearance or behavior, handicapped individuals tend to be devalued by others, and subsequently are viewed as being far less capable or competent than is really the case (Gold, 1976).

It has been noted by Martin (1971) that there are considerable economic liabilities associated with overlooking the school-age handicapped population who are about to enter the workforce.

> Over the next four years, 2.5 million handicapped children will be school leavers either by graduation or the drop-out route. Of that number, less than 1 in 4 will be fully employed or going on to college. Another 40%, that is one million handicapped young people, will be underemployed. Another 25% of this population will probably require welfare assistance.
>
> If each of these youngsters is faced with institutionalization as an alternative to public school programming, the cost will be at least $4000 per year. Over a lifetime of 60 years, that is approximately a quarter of a million dollars per student.

General estimates suggest that approximately one of every ten children are handicapped. If society is not prepared to provide an appropriate education that enables these individuals to either successfully enter post-secondary education or the labor force with a marketable set of occupational competencies, we must be prepared to continue accepting the economic burden of supporting millions of potentially employable individuals in institutions and through welfare programs.

A series of problems have plagued the process of employing handicapped individuals. Many employers and union officials have demonstrated less than accepting attitudes toward capable and qualified handicapped applicants. In some states it is difficult for employers to obtain appropriate insurance to cover handicapped workers. Architectural barriers have prevented numerous physically handicapped individuals from entering or functioning in certain places of prospective employment. Stereotyping relative to the capability of individuals with certain handicaps to perform successfully in selected occupations has often influenced managerial decisions relative to hiring, job assignment, and promotion. Also, management has often been hesitant to redesign or modify occupational tasks to accomodate individuals with handicaps, even though this practice has been demonstrated as cost-efficient and cost-effective in many work environments.

According to the Census, there are nearly 12 million employable handicapped individuals between the ages of 16 and 64. However, it is important to note that in many occupational fields employers have not been provided with an overabundant supply of potential handicapped employees (President's

Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, 1976). This accurately suggests that there have been a number of problems in the process of providing appropriate vocational education experiences for handicapped students. Among the more significant problems are the following:

- Few handicapped individuals are receiving vocational education in the public schools (GAO, 1976)
- Vocational educators generally lack training in dealing with the handicapped (GAO, 1976)
- Because handicapped students have encountered problems in competing with nonhandicapped students in regular vocational classes, their opportunities to obtain training have often been restricted to sheltered workshops, separate programs, or institutions. In such programs the range of occupational training experiences offered is usually limited (Olympus Research Corporation, 1975)
- States have provided only minimal matching funding for vocational education for the handicapped. In 1973, 14 states did not spend the 10% of their Federal vocational education funds for education of the handicapped as required by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (GAO, 1974)
- There has been an absence of cooperative planning on the part of vocational and special education personnel at both the state and local levels (Geer, 1975).

This is but a brief overview of the major problems associated with vocational education and employment of the handicapped. Numerous other complex issues such as the influences of high unemployment rates and reduced funds for rehabilitation services have not been discussed, but certainly have an impact upon the existing problems.

Recent Federal Initiatives

In response to the aforementioned concerns relative to education and employment of the handicapped, several legislative initiatives have been enacted by the U.S. Congress in the last two years. Four of these initiatives which contain specific implications for school and rehabilitation personnel will be outlined here.

P.L. 94-142: The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975. This sweeping legislation is essentially a national mandatory special education law charging state and local education agencies with the responsibility of providing a free and appropriate public education for all handicapped children ages 3-21. Numerous procedural safeguards such as the following are guaranteed: due process procedures; all education and training to be provided through individual educational plans; all education and training to be provided in the least restrictive environment for the individual; use of nondiscriminatory testing and evaluation procedures; and assuring confidentiality of information. The broad implications of the law have been outlined in a variety of recent publications (Irvin, 1976; and Halloran, 1976; Goodman, 1976).

P.L. 94-142 contains several specific provisions which will directly effect vocational education of the handicapped. First, in their annual program plans submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, States must insure that funds received under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1976 are used in a manner consistent with the goal of providing a free and appropriate public education. Since "appropriate education" is defined to include individual educational plans (IEP), handicapped students enrolled in regular, as well as special vocational schools or classes, will have IEP's. Second, under the full educational opportunity goal, the legislation specifically states that

> . . . State and local educational agencies shall take steps to insure that handicapped children have available to them the variety of programs and services available to non-handicapped children, including . . . industrial arts, home economics, and vocational education.

Third, the IEP's to be developed ". . . must include a statement of the child's present level of educational performance, including academic achievement, . . . prevocational and vocational skills." If a determination is made that the learner is deficient in these skills and is in need of remediation, specific short-range instructional objectives, time lines, and a measurable criteria for evaluation in each skill area are to be included in the IEP. To facilitate the implementation of these provisions in vocational preparation programs, comprehensive inservice and preservice training programs are to be outlined by state and local educational agencies. Based on these plans, funds to provide inservice training, follow-up technical assistance, and current information on research and new knowledge relative to serving the handicapped will be available to special education personnel, as well as regular educators, vocational educators, career guidance counselors, work-study coordinators, and job placement personnel.

Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Although many businesses and industries have hired handicapped individuals in the past, many employers or businesses have systematically or unconsciously excluded the handicapped. Some exclusion has resulted from the existence of architectural barriers while, in other instances, exclusion has resulted from attitudinal barriers. Employers have also noted that in many communities they cannot find qualified, trained handicapped individuals. Section 503 is intended to eliminate many of the barriers associated with hiring, promotion, and retention of handicapped individuals.

Section 503 is focused on employers with federal contracts of more than $2,500. It states that employers with such contracts must take affirmative action to hire handicapped people. In addition to hiring practices, the affirmative action plan must also address practices related to job assignments, promotions, training, transfer, accessibility, working conditions, and termination. Section 503 covers all levels of employment including management and executive positions.

"Accomodation" of handicapped individuals in employment practices is the key enforcement consideration. There are no time lines or quotas established which would force employers to immediately recruit or employ the handicapped. The regulation requires the employer to make "reasonable accomodations" for all handicapped individuals interested in employment. "Reasonable accomodation" is determined by a review of the employer's affirmative action program. Such outreach practices as the following must be reflected in the affirmative action plan:

- Recruitment at schools for handicapped students--state schools for the blind, deaf, mentally handicapped, and physically handicapped
- Use of all recruiting sources, such as state employment services, vocational rehabilitation, sheltered workshops, state education agencies, college placement offices, organizations of and for handicapped persons, etc.
- Obtainment of advice on placement, accomodations, recruitment, and training from handicapped organizations, vocational rehabilitation, voluntary health organizations, etc.
- Efforts to build acceptance of handicapped employees by managers, supervisors, and all employees through internal communications
- Periodic review of employment records of handicapped persons to determine whether their full abilities are being utilized
- Participation in career days, work-study programs, and other efforts to facilitate community awareness of the intent to hire handicapped individuals.

It should be pointed out that not all handicapped individuals are covered. A potential handicapped employee must be "qualified," and capable of performing a job with "reasonable accomodation" to his handicap. The enforcement procedure can be initiated by individuals with documented handicapping conditions filing a written complaint with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance of the Department of Labor if they feel they have been discriminated against on the basis of their handicap.

Finally, contractors cannot fulfill their obligations by simply subcontracting with sheltered workshops. Sheltered workshops can be considered as part of a positive affirmative action program if the workshop is involved in training handicapped workers who will be employed directly by the company once the training is completed.

Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. This set of regulations, when finalized, will prohibit discrimination on the basis of handicap in any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. Although this specific section prohibits discrimination in the use of U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare funds, Executive Order 11914, issued in April, 1976, mandates that nondiscriminatory practices be implemented governmentwide. The Office of Civil Rights, which is charged with the regulatory responsibility for Section 504, has been directed to issue general standards and procedures for other governmental agencies to follow.

Section 503, which was discussed earlier, requires employers with federal contracts to have affirmative action practices to employ and advance the handicapped. Section 504 calls for similar, but expanded nondiscriminatory practices for all grant programs or activities financed totally, or in part, by Federal funds.

The proposed rules and regulations, which were published in July, 1976, and should be finalized in the Spring, contain six major sections. Subpart A outlines the purpose, intent, definitions, and specific discriminatory practices that are prohibited. The basic provision states that:

> No qualified handicapped persons shall, on the basis of handicap, be excluded from participation in, or be denied the benefits of, or otherwise be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity which receives or benefits from Federal financial assistance.

Among the discriminatory actions which are prohibited are the following:

- Denying handicapped individuals the opportunity to participate in or benefit from aids, benefits, or services which are not equal to the opportunities afforded others
- Providing aids, benefits, or services to handicapped individuals which are not as effective as those provided to others
- Providing different or separate aids, benefits or services to handicapped individuals unless such an action is necessary to insure the effectiveness of such aids, benefits, or services
- Selecting locations for facilities which may have the effect of excluding handicapped persons or otherwise denying them benefits or services.

Subpart B reiterates from Section 503 the initiatives which must be taken to recruit, employ, equally compensate, train, and promote handicapped individuals in programs or activities which are supported with Federal funds. Subpart C speaks to the need for barrier-free environments to insure program accessibility. Both existing facilities and new construction must have accessible facilities.

Subpart D addresses Federally supported programs for preschool, elementary, secondary, and adult education. Many of the provisions in this section are identical or similar to the assurances provided in P.L. 94-142, and speak to providing free and appropriate educational programs in the most normal setting feasible.

Subpart E focuses on post-secondary education programs, including post-secondary vocational education programs. Here also, no qualified handicapped student shall be subjected to discrimination on the basis of his/her handicap in recruitment and admission procedures, or programs and/or services in such areas as: occupational training, academic education, research, housing, health, counseling, financial aid, physical education, athletics, recreation, transportation, or other extracurricular activities.

The final section, Subpart F, applies to health, welfare and other social service programs and activities which receive a benefit from Federal financial assistance. It also assures that eligible, qualified handicapped recipients are not to be discriminated against in the receipt of such services.

P.L. 94-482: Education Amendments of 1976. Title II of this Act represents a new piece of Federal legislation for vocational education programs. Since the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, states have been required to spend at least 10% of their basic state grant for vocational education programs and services for the handicapped. In Fiscal Year 1975, 10% of the state grant program totalled 43.8 million dollars.

The new 1976 Amendments continues the 10% setaside, but now requires 50% matching of state and local funds. Since most states were not equally matching these funds in the past, the total number of dollars available for vocational education for the handicapped will increase considerably.

The Act also requires that a written assurance be provided that the Five-Year and Annual Program Plans submitted by a state be consistent with the state plan for education of the handicapped. As noted in the earlier discussion of P.L. 94-142, it appears that this means that all of the procedural safeguards and assurances from 94-142 will be extended to handicapped learners served under the vocational education legislation. Previously only a limited number of the students identified as "handicapped" and enrolled in vocational education programs were also identified and served in special education programs. This assurance clause should greatly enhance the consistency of curriculum objectives and individualized instruction efforts between vocational and special educators.

Implications for Future Practice

When new legislation first arrives on the scene, the implications for change are often viewed as complex, monumental in scope, and burdensome. However, advocates for the handicapped view these recent initiatives as assuring the protection of the basic human rights of handicapped individuals. Given the highly prescriptive nature of P.L. 94-142 and Section 504, it becomes quite clear that providing protection against discriminatory practices is, indeed, a complex matter. Striking a balance between protecting the rights of the handicapped and not placing unrealistic mandates for immediate change on employers and schools has taken time and prudence on the part of those agencies responsible for developing rules and regulations.

There remains a number of unclear sections in the laws, as well as several related constitutional questions which will likely have to be resolved in the courts before the full range of implications can be recognized. There are, however, a number of discernible and important implications for the process of vocational education and employment contained in these four Federal initiatives. Among the major implications for future job preparation and employment practices are the following:

- The clear mandate for protection of rights of the handicapped to education and fair treatment in employment calls for significant changes in the existing systems for vocational education, special education, vocational rehabilitation, job placement, and personnel management in business and industry. Several new personnel roles (e.g. hearing officers or handicapped affirmative action specialists) will be created or become more prominent. To effectively serve the handicapped in the future, all of these systems must provide services in a manner which is accomodating to the individual's handicap and at the same time does not restrict the individual's constitutional right to receive such services in the lease restrictive environment.

- The range of individual differences in students in regular school programs will be expanded as will the diversity of individuals in the nation's workforce. A general attitude of acceptance, as well as organized programs of awareness and public information, and inservice education will be critical to successful implementation of the intent of the Congress.
- There currently is, and there will continue to be, a significant need for preservice and inservice education of all personnel in the job preparation and placement process. To address this need, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped is currently spending 5-6% (approximately $2.5 million) of its annual $40 million budget for personnel preparation on the inservice and preservice education of personnel to provide vocational and career education for the handicapped.
- Increased cooperation between schools and business and industry is also imperative. Such cooperation is essential for insuring that an appropriate supply of handicapped individuals, who are trained and competent in needed occupations, is reached and sustained. Expanded work-study programs which provide handicapped learners with a broad range of part-time occupational experiences in local businesses and industries while still attending school could greatly facilitate

communication between employers and school personnel. Vocational education advisory committees, which are composed of local businessmen, must begin to review more closely the needs of handicapped students enrolled in vocational education programs.

Public Involvement is Essential

As noted earlier, the final rules and regulations for three of the four legislative initiatives have not been published. By law, suggestions and comments from the public are solicited to aid in preparation of the final regulations. The proposed rules and regulations for the new Vocational Education Act (PL 94-482) will be published in the Federal Register in mid-March. A 60-day public comment period will then follow. Advocates for vocational education should review and react to the proposed regulations by submission of written comments or testimony at public hearings which will be held at various locations around the nation.

The comment period for the proposed regulations for PL 94-142 closed on March 1, 1977, and the final regulations are scheduled to be published in May. The public comment period for the proposed regulations for Section 504 has also closed, but numerous substantive issues and questions have delayed the process of preparing the final regulations. Because of the highly prescriptive nature of these provisions, and the problems which state and local education agencies may encounter in implementing these mandates, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has attempted to formulate only minimal regulations. In the future as need and experience dictate, action will be taken to amend or revise the regulations (Federal

Register, December 30, 1976).

Copies of the proposed or final regulations for PL 94-142, PL 94-482, and Section 504 can be obtained by writing: The Division of Assistance to States, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. A layman's "Pocketguide for Affirmative Action to Employ the Handicapped" (Section 503), and a copy of the final rules and regulations for Section 503 can be obtained free of charge by writing: The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, Washington, D.C. 20210.

Bibliography

Federal Register, Part IV, Assistance to States, December 20, 1976.

Geer, W.C. Testimony given before House of Representatives, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, Washington, D.C., March 19, 1975.

General Accounting Office. Training educators for the handicapped: A need to redirect federal programs. Washington, D.C.: Comptroller General of the United States, September, 1976.

General Accounting Office. What is the role of federal assistance for vocational education? Washington, D.C.: Comptroller General of the United States, December, 1974.

Gold, M.W. Meeting the needs of the handicapped. Paper presented to the National Bicentennial Conference on Vocational Education, Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 1, 1974.

Goodman, L. A bill of rights for the handicapped. American Education, July, 1976.

Irvin, T. Implementation of Public Law 94-142. Exceptional Children, 43 (3), November, 1976, 135-137.

Martin, E. New public priorities: Education of handicapped children. Compact, August, 1971, 4-7.

Olympus Research Corporation. An assessment of vocational education programs for the handicapped under Part B of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Research Corporation, 1975.

Phelps, L. A. and Halloran, W.D. Assurances for handicapped learners: A new federal law supports expanded role for vocational education. American Vocational Journal, 51(8), November, 1976, 36-37.

President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Affirmative action to employ the handicapped: A pocketguide. Washington, D.C.: President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, 1976.

Discussion Regarding The New Arena

Mr. Robert Chenoweth
Assistant Attorney General
Commonwealth of Kentucky

I work with the State Department of Education, and I think the legal implications for the State Department of Education are not really a whole lot different than the legal implications or relationship that these laws have with all of us - SEA's, LEA's, you in your roles, and the universities and colleges, throughout the nation. The real question deals with how we are going to carry out what this federal law is saying.

It is now our requirement to see that the intent of Congress is carried out. Of the things that can be very, very helpful in carrying out the legal implications of these federal pieces of legislation, one strategy would be in having follow-up state laws. Now some of you may surely disagree. But, I think, that here in Kentucky, before PL 94.142, when we had been taken to task, we had been taken to federal court. We were told by federal court to take care of the exceptional children in this Commonwealth. We didn't have any choice at that point in time. We did enter into a consent decree in the Eastern District Federal Court here and we said that we would comply. Following that federal decree were some state legislation and regulations. All in all, not without having had a number of pitfalls and still having problems, we have supported these requirements with good state laws and good regulations. And now with PL 94-142 fully in effect and having to comply, we in this state have begun to work on what I think is an excellent due process policy and procedural manual for use in the exceptional children area that covers the many requirements of PL 94-142.

In terms of the information from the Department of Education, and that which I have received in talking with some of the individuals that have been going throughout various parts of the United States, at least in the eastern part of the United States, in trying to help states come to grips with PL 94-142, I think Kentucky may have at least a half-step on a fair number of states because of the movements that had already been taken before PL 94-142 had gone into effect, plus a very rapid movement to actively comply with the law.

One of the legal implications of this federal law would be to have a good system of state school laws. Then those people who have the responsibility of monitoring the people who are going to have to carry out the compliance should have already become familiar with the regulations. It seems that people look at these federal laws and all those many pages of fine print and they try and read that federal law with all the "provisos" and "howevers." They really feel frustrated. I think the States really do a little bit better job writing legislation with which people can feel comfortable. I think it will help the teachers and the state education association should attempt to get good state laws that would help the teachers as well as all other individuals who work in this area in an effort to carry out the requirements of these federal laws.

We have decent exceptional children laws. We have good vocational laws in this state. In the 1976 General Assembly (our General Assembly meets every other year) we passed a Career Education Act of 1976. I think it will serve as a very good overlay or underlay, at least it is going to be quite effective as Kentucky attempts to carry out the legal mandates of the federal law. Our Kentucky Career Education Act and the General Assembly of Kentucky said that this legislation is to emphasize the right of each student in the public schools of the state to obtain the basic knowledge and learning skills necessary for life preparation as the first priority for public education. That is a state General Assembly intent. I think you will notice that it says each student. It will apply for the "normal child" as well the handicapped and/or exceptional child. It's going to apply to vocational programs. There isn't any program or place that will escape the impact of such legislation.

Further, our statute goes on to say that each student in the public school is to be provided the opportunity to avail himself of those programs and services appropriate to his educational needs in the areas of basic academic and learning skill development. The state law can be a big help in carrying out legislative initiatives.

Of course, we do have to come to grips with the certain pressure points in the federal law. Our LEA's are going to have to provide an individual appropriate educational program that is going to enable all handicapped individuals to either prepare themselves to further their education or to get into the labor market with some occupational abilities that are going to make them as competitive as possible in that market.

Part of the legal implications, and maybe the first one that I see as Assistant Attorney General here in Kentucky, at least, is attitudinal. I think that one of the things that we have to do is get people thinking that these laws are rights of children, rights of individuals. It is not just more federal legislation, not just more federal laws to be rammed down our throats. It really amazes me sometimes when I talk to teachers and other people and we start talking about the Family Rights Privacy Act of 1974, or about Title IX, and we talk about the other federal legislations, the kind of attitude expressed many times is directly related to the fact that there are already too many federal laws and controls. These people in Washington are telling us what to do because they know that we need the money, for we have to have the money to carry on certain kinds of programs. They are going to run our show more and more. I think that it is really a sad fact when people view, especially this kind of law, in that manner. It is, certainly, to be viewed as the right of children, the right of all children in our school system.

I wrote an opinion within the last couple of weeks that I suspect upset some of our educational leaders here in Kentucky that should not have upset any of them. The question was simply whether you have to continue to provide an educational program for an exceptional child as defined by the Kentucky law, consistent with PL 94-142, when the child is no longer at school age, which is 16. At first, when that question came into my office, it didn't even strike me as to what the question was. I had for so long been thinking that the compulsory age and our compulsory laws in Kentucky would have nothing to do with the exceptional children laws. Compulsory school laws are in some ways unfortunate, but I guess they are a necessary evil. All of us have them, I believe, except the State of Mississippi. But it is really only to keep kids enrolled. It's not for the one's who want to stay in; it's not going to have any impact on them at all. I responded affirmatively to a superintendent of public schools here in Kentucky. For the child who is now 16 years of age you do have to continue to provide the educational program for the handicapped exceptional child.

In Kentucky we have a law that says a child shall have either twelve years of education or reach the age of 21. What that is saying is that you are to get twelve years of education up through the time you reach 21 - it's kind of a which comes first proposition. The same thing goes for that exceptional child as for the so-called "normal child." We have to start having people realize that such is what these federal laws and state laws are saying. Because the history in Kentucky, as I have been told, is such that when a kid is handicapped or exceptional and if he or she has gotten any kind of training at all during at least the compulsory school age, as soon as they hit that magical 16 it was virtually drop-out time. Just cut them off. No more program. What are they going to do? It is really a sad situation. One which I think is going to be quickly changing if it is not already changed. So I think we need to try through our state educational associations to work to carry out this federal mandate in terms of displaying the sincere attitude that this federal law deserves in getting these kids the individual appropriate education that they rightfully deserve.

The state education associations are also going to have to work with a never-tiring effort to comply with this law in order to become more familiar with the programs and activities that may be developed for the handicapped. They are going to have to adapt existing programs. That's not to say that you have to start out from scratch and everything has to be new, because certainly that isn't the case. I don't think that there was any intent in the federal law that such would be the case. Certainly you can, and should, adapt existing programs of vocational and technical post-secondary or adult education to the specialties of handicapped persons.

Of course one of the biggest things we are facing is the location, identification, and evaluation of the individual who may have a handicapping condition or is an exceptional child that is a looming thing. We are finding that to be the case here in Kentucky. We are presently involved in a program called "Child Find." It is an attempt to locate these kids. To get them located so that we can start working with them and carrying out the requirements of the federal laws as relates to that particular child and that particular child's position.

We have things come in that amaze me. Recently two children, one ten and the other fourteen, were just found. The children had never been in school before. These children were exceptional children under the definition of the law. State education associations are going to have to develop and work to have these kinds of endeavors for the location, identification, and evaluation of the children and the individuals throughout the states to determine if these individuals are receiving the needed special education that the federal law says they are to have.

Another very important point which I made mention of earlier is the procedural safeguards aspect of the federal laws. These laws are sometimes looked at as almost being civil rights kind of laws because they do have built in them fundamental constitutional due process of law requirements, with which we must comply. These are new kinds of concepts for lay people, for teachers, for all of us. We see through our court cases and pieces of federal legislation that when you are having actions taken against, or with, or for a child and a child's parents or guardian, you are to follow the basic rudimentary due process procedures.

People have trouble with that. What did that really mean? How do I carry that out? What does it mean to have a due process hearing? That is one of the ways that our due process and procedures manual is hopefully going to assist. Our Kentucky due process and procedure manual will be referred to by a cover regulation. That regulation, once passed by our State Board of Education, will have the effect of law, which means the due process and procedural manual will have the effect of law. It will be widely distributed, of course, throughout the Commonwealth. Not only to people in education, but to anyone who may have concern with an exceptional child. It's quite easy to read. It tells what is required for a hearing and when a hearing is available. How an impartial hearing officer is going to be appointed. What you can do if you don't like that impartial hearing officer. And, what will happen once you go through the hearing process if you are not satisfied with the results of that hearing. How you can appeal. The manual should prove quite beneficial and all of the state education associations, without question, are going to have to do a very similar kind of task to help the people, be they teachers or be they the Moms and Dads and community individuals, to gain a better understanding of these federal laws.

We have to have non-discriminatory testing and evaluation in non-physically segregated classes where at all possible. Those are going to be changes. This may seem to be a seemingly difficult thing to grasp - having to provide equal access for all children, be they handicapped or not, male or female, as well as for the various vocational training programs. Of course, some of the requirement for such programming is evident under other federal law, Title IX, for example.

Another significant problem will be the removal of the architectural barriers. It's a money type of proposition, but we are going to have to do it. We are going to have to work with the teacher education institutions. I say that from the standpoint of the SEA. They are going to have to have a very good liaison with the teacher education institutions as to the way the institutions such as you represent, view the legal implications and the practical implications of these federal laws so that there can be very good cooperation in meeting the goals that everyone should be attempting to achieve within the federal legislation.

We are going to have to train personnel and in my opinion, that is not going to be just the vocational teacher or the special education teacher. Talking with a teachers association here a few days ago, one of the comments made during the informal discussion was relative to a teacher not being a special education teacher and also involved with special education. That teacher felt responsible to try and help carry out the federal law, and yet, there was no direct information sharing. We are going to have to have in-service training programs for other teachers.

Work to involve the parents, relatives, and especially the members of the community at large in the towns that we are all about. I think there is probably a great lack of knowledge about these federal laws. They read in the newspaper and they see that there is a change coming or we're having to do things now that we didn't have to do before. We are going to have to help some of those people understand that the direction we are taking has been mandated. Regarding these federal laws, the real legal implication is that we must strive to attain the reality of full educational and occupational opportunities for the handicapped.

As has been said and you may have read, "Give a man a fish and he can live for a day. Teach a man to fish and he can live for a lifetime."

IMPLICATIONS OF PL 94-142:

THE LOCAL SCHOOL PERSPECTIVE

Henry V. Colella
Assistant Superintendent for Special Education
Nassau Board of Cooperative Educational Services
Salisbury Center
Westbury, New York

Hailed as the Bill of Rights for the handicapped, the most vital aspect of PL 94-142 is the credence given to the handicapped population of this country as productive, responsible citizens with privileges and rights equal to those of their non-handicapped peers. The most significant facet of this important piece of legislation is mandated, individualized educational plans. The basic tenet of special education has always been, and will always be, individualized instruction. As special educators, we can honestly be proud of providing to the arena of education the concept and implementation of individualized instruction. It has been with us for years and we probably say that we are further ahead than any other area of education in the development of individualized instruction.

While the Act itself focuses on a guaranteed free public education for handicapped children and youth between 3 and 21 years of age, a truly significant omission of PL 94-142 is the noticeable absence of any thrust related to career education for the handicapped.

I'd like to share with you a practical definition that I have of career education. Career education is any activity or experience that promotes the purpose of preparing the youngster for the role of adulthood. And a job is but one facet of that role.

With regard to some implications of PL 94-142, the first and foremost need will be the development of a comprehensive personnel development program for regular general educators. Since a focus of this Act relates to "least restrictive environment", vocational educators, general educators, and special educators will be called upon to provide more essential services. Current teacher graduates will also need added training in the preparation of individualized educational plans.

Let me get to vocational education for a moment. Traditionally, the term occupational education has been used synonymously with vocational education. Vocational education has historically placed little emphasis on programming for the handicapped. One of the barriers that has prohibited vocational education from participating in the development of vocational programs for the handicapped has been that vocational educators generally lack training in dealing with the handicapped. One real reason that is expressed by vocational education teachers is fear. It is the fear of having to deal with tough behavior. The kind of youngster I am talking about, for example . . . fifteen years of age, manifests street behavior, clever affability, is defiant and potentially agressive. This is the kind of youngster who might also have a previous track record with law enforcement authorities. As a result, the vocational education teacher--who already has 20-25 (maybe higher) youngsters in his automotive shop--experiences an immense burden of responsibility to provide services to all youngsters under his jurisdiction. The vocational educator looks at his trade from the point of view that he would like to pass on his knowledge to the next generation of tradesmen. Some teachers in vocational education are outstanding in dealing with the handicapped. For those teachers who can benefit, special educators can assist in helping vocational educators to gain other cogent skills such as understanding the psychological aspects of the handicapping condition and communicating acitvities that are highly motivating. The bottom line is the vocational education teacher's attempt to translate activities into skills that will lead toward the student gaining entry level employment.

The implication of large numbers of handicapped youth being placed in the "least restrictive environment" in vocational education is a frightening responsibility to vocational educators. Such responsibility can be met successfully with intensive staff training encompassing the cooperative resources of special educators. The financial impact of this activity will bear upon the local districts' already beleaguered budgets. Another factor delimiting access to the "least restrictive environment" is the fact that some vocational teachers do not want the handicapped placed into their classes. Their reason surrounds the belief that training the handicapped for their vocational skill area reduces the status of the non-handicapped who ostensibly are learning a set of skills they are more capable of achieving than the handicapped. When you talk to vocational education teachers, some will admit that they have been taking handicapped kids into their classes for years. No one has labeled the youngsters handicapped. Who among vocational educators would deny the presence of the educable mentally retarded in their classes, at least in terms of functional level? In fact, a minority of youngsters in this category have achieved significant status in occupations.

In the fiscal year 1974, the Office of Education reported that vocational education served thirteen million individuals nationally. Less than two percent of that number were handicapped youth. At the same time, the Office of Education has estimated that 10% of the school-aged population have learning deficits.

In that same year, a BEH study found that more handicapped students could be served by integrating them into regular vocational education classes than by establishing separate programs or separate facilities for them. That's quite true. Because again, one of the implications of the concept of "least restrictive environment" is that at the moment, there are relatively few comprehensive career education programs in special education. I know of very few recorded programs that run from kindergarten on up to adulthood. Many programs are begun at a specific age level, usually at the secondary level . . . age 15 and above. With the introduction of 94-142, vocational educators are going to be asked to absorb many more handicapped youngsters than ever before. They can't, however, do it alone. They again will need the assistance of special educators.

Career education doesn't have to cost significantly more money than is presently expended. It may, however, reflect the need to reallocate existing resources in the local public schools. It will be necessary to have a coordination of effort, a cross-fertilization of faculty, a marriage between occupational education and special education.

I would like to get back to an earlier comment, that is, as more youngsters enter vocational education programs, numbers of options will increase. For example, in a work-study program in a segregated setting, 10, 11, 12 or 15 handicapped kids may spend half a day learning life skills in association with academically related subject matter and a half a day in the community in a work experience program. Some students who leave this setting may be fortunate to gain employment as a result. In a vocational high school, a youngster may have the opportunity to select from among 60 different course offerings--thereby increasing his/her opportunities to gain a variety of skills.

On another, but equally important, matter . . . teacher unions will become more militant with regard to the implications of PL 94-142. Teacher bargaining units are not interested in increasing vocational education classes from their present class sizes of 22, 25, or 30. While they support, basically, the concept of mainstreaming, teachers are requesting more money to deal with handicapped youngsters.

In terms of the teacher training that will be required, both from the preservice level and in-service level, teachers will demand additional course credit that they can translate into additional salary. At the Nassau Board of Cooperative Services, we have to annually budget approximately $75,000 for across the board credit. While I am philosophically opposed to this expenditure, I recognize our contractual obligations. Frankly, I do not believe that the public schools ought to be in competition with universities in teacher training. Yet, at the same time, I believe we can assist universities in this important endeavor. There exists a reservoir of talent available in the public schools that universities can find beneficial. In-service training ought to take place in the schools and ought to be experience based.

Another problem is the uncoordinated effort at state education department levels. We still have some education departments where you have an office of occupational/vocational education and an office of vocational rehabilitation who do not communicate with each other. Very often, needless duplication takes place and cooperative planning is noticeably absent.

Both departments also have their own constituencies and priorities at the state level may vary significantly.

If I may again reflect on staff development, in 1974, of 266,000 teachers in vocational education in this country, approximately 109,000 of them had received in-service training of some type. Only 500 of the 266,000 received any specialized training for working with handicapped. That's one half of one percent of that total number.

The need is present. It clearly exists. It has been documented. The role of staff development will fall upon each of you in the near future.

Approximately 60% of all the handicapped in this country are not receiving educational services that they require. Why aren't they receiving them? Dollars. It is a dollar problem. Superintendents of schools and school boards have a responsibility to all the youngsters in their district, including the handicapped. PL 94-142 will mandate expanded services to the handicapped and hopefully provide school districts additional revenue to cope with the increasing demands of providing for the handicapped.

One of the arenas in which we as educators will have to become involved is the area of due process. We are in the age of litigation. The involvement of parents in the development of individual educational plans is a complicated process. It takes considerable time to train a staff of teachers to be able to develop a standardized format for reporting purposes. We must accomplish this task annually. We must involve parents. There is no present identification of what constitutes the role of parents in this process. How will parents get involved in professional matters, professional decisions? We will be tested to demonstrate our professional competence to develop plans for remediating deficiencies. One must have considerable skill to apply individualized strategy to learning problems.

Vocational education teachers who have had no experience in dealing with the handicapped will be asked to write individual education plans. Who will have the responsibility for this arena of staff training? Other questions will emerge, such as: When is a youngster ready to be referred to vocational education? Is there an identifiable referral process? Vocational education will have to develop a referral process that will reflect the need to deliver services to youngsters with different etiologies. Traditionally, vocational educators have not dealt in any significant way with cumulative records nor have they had to deal with parents of the handicapped.

If one of the priorities of PL 94-142 is the unserved population, who will these youngsters be? They will be severely impaired in the main. Such youngsters are going to primarily come from institutionalized populations. Are public schools ready to absorb these youngsters? Are communities ready to accept their presence? The answer will undoubtedly be evident in a growing proliferation of public school services to the severely impaired who can benefit from the acitvities associated with career education. While expectations for independent living may be guarded, all effort must be expended for the severely impaired to lead useful, contributing lives.

A major burden of responsibility will fall upon outside specialists. For example, the role of guidance counselors working with the handicapped will expand. How will this guidance counselor work effectively with the parent of a youngster who has been clinically diagnosed as a childhood schizophrenic and is now seventeen years of age with a guarded prognosis for adult adjustment? In some cases, the parent may have unrealistic aspirations with regard to the potential of their youngster. To view vocational training as a panacea may be a dramatic mistake and mislead the parent and perhaps cause the parent's further distrust of educators.

Vocational educators have historically been concerned with product. On the other hand, special educators have been primarily concerned with process. The bottom line is, does the youngster leave public education with salable skills? Is he able to go out and enter the community and contribute to society? When we can document such results, in the majority of cases, we will have grown in stature in the minds of the citizens who support public education. More importantly, we would have provided self-esteem and dignity to the handicapped.

Another implication of individual educational plans is related to the evaluative process of teachers. Some teachers will be threatened by the potential utilization of individual educational plans as the foundation for determining their performance. While this may be true, the preparation of individual educational plans will promote better teaching as a result. If a teacher is conscious about writing behavioral objectives and knows where she is going, she becomes a better teacher. It's easier to evaluate the performance of that teacher. Some teachers who have been doing nothing but breathing for a number of years have looked at this prospect in a very threatening manner. Administrators themselves will have to become more skilled in evaluating performance based upon the planning and implementation of individual educational plans. What you write on these plans and how you record and report progress to a parent is going to be a significant responsibility, especially noting the specter of due process.

As such, we will be faced with the prospect of increased litigation as a result of PL 94-142 and much of it is going to come as a result of the individual education plans. The courts will test our professional knowledge. The next ten years will bring litigation against schools challenging non-compliance of PL 94-142. What will constitute an appropriate educational program? Who will determine that? Who will pay the legal costs associated with litigation surrounding IEP's? Will the time spent by personnel at hearings in due process result in a loss of service to other youngsters? I am afraid that the answer to what is an appropriate educational program will not come from educators. The courts will determine standards as well as the limits of parents' veto of school programs.

Parents have become partners in education. I believe this can be beneficial. However, it is factual that some educational administrators are reticent to accept the involvement of parents. In reality, they may be threatened by decision sharing and a loss of administrative prerogative. Standards of evaluation will also be established by the courts. They have not been established by educators. I am also concerned that the courts are going to use third-party negotiators to expedite services to youngsters. Who will those third-party negotiators be? My prediction that is they will be legal advocates.

In conclusion, our increased responsibilities as educators to youngsters, parents and to legal advocates with respect to complying with the intent of PL 94-142, will hold each of us more accountable for our efforts and consequently should lead toward an enhanced level of the quality of services that the handicapped so richly deserve.

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Ms. Misha Phillips
Director, Child Service Demonstration Center
Bureau of Education of Exceptional Children
Kentucky State Department of Education
Frankfort, Kentucky

"The past few years have witnessed a growing awareness of the need for educational institutions to be held accountable for the provisions of quality services to handicapped children and their families. This awareness is evident both in court decisions and in the passage of the federal and state laws which require that definite procedures be followed in delivering special educational services.

Recent litigation has made due process a reality for the field of special education. At the national level, the increasing focus on due process and simultaneous acceleration in federal funding and involvement have been accompanied by an increase in federal efforts to exercise more control over the kinds and quality of educational programs being offered to handicapped children."[1]

The trends of the past few years culminated in the passage of a federal law: Public Law 94-142, The Education For All Handicapped Children Act. The primary purpose of this law is to assure a free and appropriate public education to handicapped children. PL 94-142 provides a mechanism for achieving this purpose by outlining, through regulations, procedures to be followed in order to provide a continuum of full educational services at the local level and in addition, specifying procedures for implementing the process which results in the development of an individualized education program for each handicapped child. One of the specific procedures is that the individualized education program must be developed for each handicapped child in a meeting which includes specific professionals and the parent who will make decisions and assume the responsibility for those decisions concerning the handicapped child.

---

[1] (Walker, J. (Ed.) Functions of the Placement Committee in Special Education: A Resource Manual. Washington, D.C., 1976. National Association of State Directors of Special Education).

It is therefore evident that the federal law mandates both the formation of a committee for decision making purposes and the development of an individualized education program for each handicapped child. In carrying out these mandates, states and local school districts are allowed some flexibility in further delineating and operationalizing the mandate of PL 94-142 through the development of state laws and regulations which will be appropriate to the respective state, yet still be in compliance with the federal law.

In order to discuss the individualized educational program as it is mandated by law, it seems particularly important to be aware of some of the general and specific references to it in the "Education For All Handicapped Children Act of 1975." One of the first references to the individualized education program comes within "Definitions" Section 448, which defines the term free appropriate public education to mean:

> "(18) . . . special education and related services which (A) have been provided at public expense, under public supervision and direction, and without charge, (B) meet the standards of the State educational agency (C) include an appropriate preschool, elementary, or secondary school education in the State involved, and (D) are provided in conformity with the individualized education program required under section 614 (a) (5).

Section 614 (a) (5) further emphasizes the importance of the individualized education program when it states that:

> "Sec. 614 (a) A local educational agency or an interme-

> diate educational unit which desires to receive payments under section 611 (d) for any fiscal year shall submit an application to the appropriate State educational agency. Such application shall -
>
> . . . .
>
> "(5) provide assurances that the local educational agency or intermediate educational unit will establish, or revise, whichever is appropriate, an individualized education program of each handicapped child at the beginning of each school year and will then review and, if appropriate, revise its provisions periodically, but not less than annually."

In addition, the Act specifically defines the "individualized education program" to mean:

> "(19) a written statement for each handicapped child developed in any meeting by a representative of the local educational agency or an intermediate educational unit who shall be qualified to provide, or supervise the provisions of, special designated instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children, the teacher, the parents or guardian of such child, and, whenever appropriate, such child, which statement shall include (A) a statement of the present levels of educational performance of such child, (B) a statement of annual goals, including short-term instructional objectives, (C) a statement of the specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular educational programs, (D) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether instructional objectives are being achieved."

Within "Eligibility" Section 612, the law requires that:

> "Sec. 612. In order to qualify for assistance under this part in any fiscal year, a State shall demonstrate to the Commissioner that the following conditions are met:
>
> . . . .
>
> "(4) Each local educational agency in the State will maintain records of the individualized education pro-

> gram for each handicapped child, and such programs shall be established, reviewed, and revised as provided in section 614 (a) (5).

In the "State Plans" Section 613, agencies and facilities which fall within the mandates of the law are specified.

> "Sec. 613. (a) Any State meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 612 and desiring to participate in the program under this part shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information, as he deems necessary. Each such plan shall--(B) (4) set forth policies and procedures to assume--
>
> "(B) that (i) handicapped children in private schools and facilities will be provided special education and related services (in conformance with an individualized educational program as required by this part) at no cost to their parents or guardian, if such children are placed in or referred to such schools or facilities by the State or appropriate local educational agency as the means of carrying out the requirements of this part or any other applicable law requiring the provision of special education and related services to all handicapped children within such State, and (ii) in all such instances the State educational agency shall determine whether such schools and facilities meet standards that apply to State and local educational agencies and that children so served have all the rights they would have if served by such agencies;

Another reference within section 613 adds the requirement of the law pertaining to the individualized education program which must be met before a State will be eligible to receive funds, is that the State shall:

> "(11) provide for procedures for evaluation at least annually of the effectiveness of programs in meeting the educational needs of handicapped children (including evaluation of individualized education programs), in accordance with such criteria that the Commissioner shall prescribe pursuant to section 617 . . .

With the consistent and repetitive references to the individualized education program throughout these sections of the law, it is apparent that the federal government views this as one of the most vital and basic components of this piece of legislation. In addition, an entire section of the regulations written for the "Implementation of Part B of the Education of the Handicapped Act" further outlines requirements for the individualized education program for each handicapped child. Each state is therefore mandated to monitor the provisions of educational and related services in order to insure that a "free appropriate public education" is provided to each handicapped child.

The State of Kentucky was given a mandate in 1974 through a consent agreement. The consent agreement mandated the state education agency to insure the provision of a free appropriate public education to handicapped children of compulsory school age. As a result of this court order, Kentucky Administrative Regulations were developed in 1975 which outlined for local school districts procedures for implementing this state mandate. At that time, the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children developed a format for the individualized education program for use by local school districts. This format included all of the requirements outlined by PL 94-142 and additional items which were felt to be necessary for developing an appropriate individualized education program. The following items were included:

1. A Statement of the Child's Present Level of Educational Performance. This includes both strengths and weaknesses of the child's performance.

2. Prioritized Annual Goals. These are the goals in order of priority which the child needs to accomplish within the school year.

3. Short-Term Instructional Objectives. These are more specific strategies which are outlined and felt to be necessary for the

child to achieve the annual goals.

4. Specific Educational and/or Support Services. Within this section any educational or related service which will assist the child in achieving in the program is to be specified.

5. Person(s) Responsible. The type of personnel who will be responsible for providing the instruction should be delineated within this area.

6. Percent of Time in Regular and Special Programs. A description of the time to be spent in the regular education program is to be specifically included as a part of the program.

7. Dates for Initiation and Anticipated Duration of Services. These dates should be projected for each instructional objective and service established in the individualized education program.

8. Review Dates. All review dates, but especially the annual review date must be established.

9. Recommendations for Specific Procedures, Techniques, and Materials. Explicit techniques, strategies, and materials should be included which will assist both the professional in providing the instruction and the child in achieving mastery of the criteria specified in the instructional objective.

10. Objective Evaluation Criteria for Each Annual Goal Statement. The evaluation methods and procedures are outlined and should be utilized during the instructional program and at the time of annual review in order to determine the child's progress.

11. Placement Recommendation. All of the specific placement recommendations are determined and stated.

The Kentucky Administrative Regulation, 707 KAR1:050 (attached), not only requires that a written summary be developed regarding each handicapped child's individual program, but this regulation also requires that this be written by a committee of specific people. The personnel to be involved and the functions and responsibilities of the two types of committees to be established in each local school district, are also outlined in 707 KAR1:050. The two committees are the Administrative Admission and Release Committee and the School Based Admission and Release Committee. Each local school district is required to establish one Administrative Admission and Release Committee and one School Based Admission and Release Committee in each school. The responsibilities of the Administrative Admission and Release Committee are somewhat broader than those of the School Based Admission and Release Committee, (707 KAR1:050) however, the committee functions remain the same. Generally, the following responsibilities are included:

1. Receive referrals.
2. Follow due process procedures to insure that exceptional children and their parents are guaranteed procedural safeguards in decisions regarding identification, evaluation, and educational placement.
3. Designate qualified persons to conduct appropriate evaluations on referred children.
4. Discuss results of formal and informal evaluations.
5. Make recommendations for appropriate services and/or programs for the referred pupils. These recommendations shall include a written summary, in educationally relevant and common terms, of the referred pupil's special needs offering explicit strategies for meeting such needs and stating criteria by which the effectiveness of such intervention strategies may be determined.
6. At least annually, review the placement of each exceptional child in the school in relation to his educational progress in that setting.
7. Determine if the local school district can provide appropriate services, if local programs must be changed to accomodate the identified child, if additional services or programs will be developed, or if the child must receive services outside the local school district.

Parents must be involved at all decision making points from the initiation of the referral through the placement and annual review of the child's individualized education program. Any professional who has information which may be relevant to the development of a particular child's individualized education program must be involved in the development of the program. Therefore, personnel from both career and vocational education should play a significant role in the development of individualized education programs.

Communication and coordination is an essential ingredient not only in the development, but in the successful implementation of an individualized education program for a handicapped child. The following individualized education program which has been developed for a secondary level educable mentally handicapped student points out the importance of the communication and coordination required between those persons responsible not only for the special education program but also the vocational and career education programs within a local school setting.

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: Total Service Plan

Child's Name Dan

Birthdate July 21, 1962

School High School

Date of Program Entry September 13, 1976

Prioritized Annual Goals:

1. To increase occupational/career vocabulary
2. To increase application of money skills to practical situations.
3. To achieve necessary entry skills in field of horticulture, sub-specialty nursery worker.
4. To improve skills necessary in obtaining and applying information about community job opportunities and benefits.
5. To expand knowledge base of community geography of metro-area.

Summary of Present Levels of Performance

Strengths: a) excellent use of auditory channel for learning. b) demonstrates good eye-hand coordination c) demonstrates specific interest and predisposition to growing plants, etc. d) good application of measurement concepts.

Weaknesses: a) limited occupational/career vocabulary

b) application of money skills to practical situations

c) knowledge of travel within community

d) awareness of job opportunities in community

e) filling out application forms

Short Term Objectives	Specific Educational and/or Support Services	Person(s) Responsible	Amount of Time	Beginning & Enging Date	Review Date
1.a. Will define 25 words per month related to practical application of money skills with 95% accuracy.	Highly structured academic program geared to Occupational English. (carry-over to Occupational Math class)	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- May 25	May 28
b. Will define 25 words per month related to field of horticulture-sub specialty nursery work wity 95% accuracy.	Same as above. (Carryover to Vo-ed class)	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- May 25	May 28
c. Will define 25 words per month related to community job opportunities and benefits with 95% accuracy.	Same as above	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- May 25	May 28

Total Service Plan (Continued) Name Dan

	Short Term Objectives	Specific Educational and/or Support Services	Person(s) Responsible	Amount of Time	Beginning & Ending Date	Review Date
d.	Will define 10 words per month related to travel in the community and geography of metro area with 95% accuracy.	Same as above (carryover to Social Studies class)	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- May 25	May 28
e.	Will define 50 words commonly found on application forms with 95% accuracy.	Same as above.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	March 21- May 13	May 16
2.a.	Will define components of a paycheck with 95% accuracy.	Highly structured academic program geared to Occupational/ Practical Math.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- Oct. 29	Nov. 1
b.	Will develop a budget for a paycheck with 95% accuracy.	Same as above.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Nov. 1- Jan. 14	Jan. 17
c.	Will identify community banking services and their usages with 95% accuracy.	Same as above.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Jan. 17- March 18	March 21
d.	Will balance a checkbook with a monthly bank statement with 100% accuracy.	Same as above.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	March 21- May 27	May 31
3.a.	Will demonstrate skills in utilization of tools and equipment used in beginning nursery operations with 100% accuracy.	Voc-ed Horticulture class with support from Occupational English and Math classes	Voc-ed teacher EMH teacher	2 1/2 hrs/day	Sept. 13- Jan. 10	Jan. 12
4.a.	Will describe 4 methods of locating information about job opportunities in the community with 95% accuracy.	Highly structured academic program geared to Occupational English	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- Oct. 29	Nov. 1

Total Service Plan (Continuted) Name Dan

Short Term Objectives		Specific Educational and/or Support Services	Person(s) Responsible	Amount of Time	Beginning & Ending Date	Review Date
b.	Will describe 8 job related benefits to be expected from an employer with 95% accuracy.	Same as above.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Nov. 1- Dec. 15	Dec. 17
c.	Will list available job opportunities in community for his speciality with 90% accuracy.	Same as above (with carryover to Voc-ed program)	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Jan. 3- Mar. 18	March 21
d.	Will list job requirements and duties for one job available within community related to his specialty with 95% accuracy.	Same as above (with carryover to Voc-ed program	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Jan. 3- Mar. 18	March 21
e.	Will list his qualifications for one job available in the community related to his specialty with 95% accuracy.	Same as above (with carryover to Voc-ed program)	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	March 21- May 27	May 31
f.	Will fill out a job application for his specialty with 100% accuracy.	Same as above.	EMH teacher	45 min/ day	March 21- May 27	May 31
5.a.	Will identify 5 methods of travel available within community with 100% accuracy.	Social Studies program with support from Occupational English	Soc. Studies teacher & EMH teacher	45 min/ day	Sept. 13 March 18	March 21
b.	Will list 5 ways to locate information on how to travel to unfamiliar places within the community with 95% accuracy.	Same as above.	Same as above	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- March 18	March 21

Total Service Plan (Continued) Name Dan

Objective Evaluation Criteria for each Annual Goal Statement

Goal 1. To be evaluated by Special Education Teacher
Goal 2. To be evaluated by Special Education Teacher
Goal 3. To be evaluated by Vocational Education Teacher and Special Education Teacher
Goal 4. To be evaluated by Special Education Teacher
Goal 5. To be evaluated by Social Studies Teacher and Special Education Teacher

Committee Recommendations for Specific Procedures, Techniques, Materials, (Include Information About Learning Style)

.Highly structured program
.Auditory presentation of material accompanying visual presentation
.Program should, when possible, include opportunity for "hands-on" tasks

Materials:
"Orientation to the World of Work"
"Grounds Keeper" - Vocational Training Curriculum
"New Rochester Occupational Reading Series"
"Transportation"
"Money Makes Sense"
"Arithmetic Kit" - Continental Press
"Social/Pre Vocational Scale" (pre- and post done by teacher)

Description and % of time in regular classroom	Committee Members Present
45 min/day in regular Social Studies class 45 min/day in Physical Education or Health as scheduled 33% of time in regular program	Principal - Parents - Counselor - EMH Teacher - Social Studies - Voc-Ed Teacher -

Placement Recommendation:	Date(s) of Meeting(s)
EMH Resource Program and Regular Program Vocational Education Program	September 6, 1976

Total Service Plan (Continued)   Name Dan

Short Term Objectives	Specific Educational and/or Support Services	Person(s) Responsible	Amount of Time	Beginning & Ending Date	Review Date
c. Will locate 10 major points on a map of metro area with 100% accuracy.	Same as above.	Same as above	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- March 18	March 21
d. Will describe how to travel (methods, route, etc.) between specified points within community with 95% accuracy.	Same as above.	Same as above	45 min/ day	Sept. 13- March 18	March 21

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: Individual Intervention Plan

(Complete one of these for each short term objective specified on Total Service Plan)

Child's Name Dan

School High School

Date of Program Entry September 13, 1976

Projected Ending Date January 10, 1976

Person(s) Completing Form Special Education Teacher (EMH)
Vo-Ed Teacher

Goal Statement: 3.0 To achieve necessary entry skills in field of horticulture sub-specialty nursery worker.

Short Term Instructional Objective: 3.a. Student will demonstrate skills in utilization of tools and equipment used in beginning nursery operations with 100% accuracy.

Task Analysis of Objectives/ Instructional Sequence	Criteria for Mastery	Strategies and/or Techniques	Materials and/or Resources	Date Started	Date Ended	Comments
1. Student will recognize tools and equipment. .Identify basic hand tools .Identify 3 pieces of power equipment .Identify garden accessories .Identify power tools	100% Accuracy	1. Teacher demonstration of tools and equipment/EMH teacher assistance in naming tools. Student identification. Audiovisual for identification of various tools. Demonstration area - layout of tools with labels giving name of tool/assistance from EMH teacher.	Hand tools: spade, shovel(round point), shovel(square), spading fork, scuffle hoe, hand weeders, trowel Lawn mowers, rotary edger, power edgers, seed spreader, graders - tiller, sprayers, turf renovators	Sept.13	Nov.1	
2. Will demonstrate safe usage hand tools - materials and power tools. .Hand Tools, power tools, and power equipment used in a nursery setting.	100% Accuracy	2. Group discussion and demonstration of safe usage of tools. Tours of work situations where tools are in use. Role play safe and unsafe work situations.	Nursery worker from local business Same tools as above.	Nov.2	Dec.13	

Individual Intervention Plan (Continued) Name Dan

Task Analysis of Objectives/ Instructional Sequence	Criteria for Mastery	Strategies and/or Techniques	Materials and/or Resources	Date Started	Date Ended	Comments
3. Demonstrate appropriate choice and use of tools for specified tasks.	100% Accuracy	3. Supervised practice of proper use of tools and machinery classifying tools into categories according to use.	Overhead of tool categories Tools	Dec. 13	Jan. 10	

INDIVUDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM: Individual Intervention Plan

(Complete one of these for each short term objective specified on Total Service Plan)

Child's Name Dan

School High School

Date of Program Entry September 13, 1976

Projected Ending Date May 31, 1977

Person(s) Completing Form EMH Teacher

Goal Statement 4. To improve skills necessary in obtaining information about community, job opportunities and benefits.

Short Term Instructional Objective: 4.f. - Dan will fill out a job application for his specialty with 100% accuracy.

Task Analysis of Objectives/ Instructional Sequence	Criteria for Mastery	Strategies and/or Techniques	Materials and/or Resources	Date Started	Date Ended	Comment
1. Given a list of words from a job application for his specialty, Dan will read the words.	95% accuracy	Dan reads words orally to teacher as teacher points to words.	Job application form, word lists,			
2. Given a list of words orally, Dan will define the words orally.	95% accuracy	Teacher presentation of definition of words. Class discussion of definitions. Teacher asks for definition of specific words.	Job application form, word lists, definitions of words.			
3. Given the instruction "Tell me your full name" Dan will orally supply the information (same instruction for all components of the form)	95% accuracy	Teacher presentation of components of form and information requested. Class discussion. Teacher gives instructions and points to component on transparency. Dan responds orally. Teacher fills in blank on transparency.	Job application form Transparency of application form			
4. Given the verbal instruction "Print your full name on the application", Dan will correctly spell and write information in the appropriate space (same instructions for all components of the form).	95% accuracy	Teacher presents to class instructions for form pointing to each component on a transparency. Teacher gives instructions. Dan fills in appropriate space with teacher assistance if needed.	Job application forms transparency			

Individual Intervention Plan (Continued)

Name Dan

Task Analysis of Objectives/ Instructional Sequence	Criteria for Mastery	Strategies and/or Techniques	Materials and/or Resources	Date Started	Date Ended	Comments
5. Given a blank job application for his specialty, Dan will fill out the form legibly and correctly.	100% accuracy	Teacher gives blank form to Dan, who will fill out form unaided.	Blank application forms.			

KENTUCKY ADMINISTRATIVE REGULATIONS

707 KAR 1:050

PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

SECTION 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS. Local boards of education shall operate programs for exceptional children of compulsory school attendance age pursuant to KRS 157.200 to 157.305, inclusive, and the criteria listed in this section and Section 2 to 10 below:

(1) Classroom unit: Classroom units for exceptional children are allocated to local school districts provided the following criteria are met:
(a) Approved teacher;
(b) Approved housing;
(c) Planned program; and
(d) Required number of children in membership.

(2) Fractional classroom unit: A fractional classroom unit is a unit having fewer pupils than the prescribed pupil-teacher ratio as indicated in the appropriate sections below or if the program is in operation for less than a full day or full school year. Such units shall be allotted and certified on a basis proportionate to the pupil-teacher ratio and/or the proportionate length of the school day or the school year.

(3) Personnel: Appropriate state certification shall be as required and provided in 704 KAR 20:205.

(4) Housing:
(a) The resource room and special class programs for exceptional children shall be housed in an elementary or secondary school, dependent upon the age range of the pupils, unless exceptions are provided in Sections 2 to 10 below pertaining to specific areas of exceptionality. Classrooms shall meet the standards for regular classrooms as specified in State Board of Education regulations.
(b) Housing for the itinerant teacher plan shall be in facilities and/or rooms appropriate for instructing pupils in small groups or individually.

(5) Program plans: The appropriate program plan for exceptional pupils shall be determined by the needs of the pupils in the local school district. Programs shall be organized and operated under one or more, or a combination of the following:
(a) A special class plan shall be a classroom-based program in which the handicapped pupil is enrolled. The chronological age range for pupils enrolled in the special class shall not exceed four (4) years. The pupils shall participate in the regular class whenever possible.
(b) A resource room plan shall be a program which serves exceptional pupils who shall be enrolled in the regular class and shall be able to do part of

their classwork in the regular class. The pupil shall go to the resource room for special instruction not available in the regular class. Not more than eight (8) pupils shall be in the resource room for instructional purposes at any one time.

(c) An itinerant teacher plan shall be a teacher who travels to the pupils' school(s) on a regularly scheduled basis to work with pupils either individually or in small groups. Pupils shall be enrolled in a regular class and shall receive a portion of their instruction in the regular program.

(d) A variation plan shall be a variation of the above plans to include one or more areas of exceptionality for which the local school district has submitted a request and received approval from the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children.

(e) Programs for the trainable mentally handicapped shall be operated under the special class plan.

(6) Teacher headquarters: For the itinerant teacher plan permanent work space, in addition to the area where personnel work with pupils, shall be provided.

(7) Travel expenses: For the itinerant teacher plan the local board of education shall defray travel expenses incurred by personnel in the execution of duties related to the program.

(8) Length of school day: The length of the school day shall be the same for non-handicapped children except as specified in KRS 157.270 and 158.060.

(9) Admission and Release Committees: Local school district personnel shall establish one (1) district-wide Administrative Admissions and Release Committee and a School-Based Admissions and Release Committee in each school with appropriate membership and functions as listed below:

(a) Administrative Admissions and Release Committee. The membership of the Administrative Admissions and Release Committee (AARC) shall consist of:

1. Director, local school district program for exceptional children, chairperson (permanent member).

2. Local school district superintendent or his designee (permanent member).

3. Referred pupil's principal (if the child is enrolled in a public or private school).

4. Involved instructional supervisor depending on the age and level of the child.

5. The parent(s) of the referred child or their designee (at parent(s) discretion).

6. Consulting members as requested by the AARC.

(b) The functions of the AARC shall include the following:

1. Receive information on identified children not currently enrolled in the local school district who are thought to need special educational services and/or programs.

2. Follow due process procedures to insure that exceptional children and their parents are guaranteed procedural safeguards in decisions regarding identification, evaluation, and educational placement.

3. Designate qualified persons to conduct appropriate evaluations on identified children.

4. Discuss results of the evaluation and make recommendations as to appropriate services and/or programs for the identified child. These recommendations shall include a written summary, in educationally relevant and common terms of the referred pupil's special needs offering explicit strategies for meeting such needs and stating criteria by which the effectiveness of such intervention strategies may be determined.

5. Determine if the local school district can provide appropriate services, if local programs must be changed to accommodate the identified child, if additional services or programs will be developed, or if the child must receive services outside the local school district.

6. Review extreme cases where the School-Based Admissions and Release Committee is not able to reach a decision on appropriate educational placement for a referred pupil and make recommendations as to appropriate educational placement.

7. At least annually, review the placement of each exceptional child living in the local school district but receiving services outside the local school district in relation to his educational progress in that setting.

8. Serve as the review committee in cases in which parents disagree with the recommendations of the SBARC as to appropriate services to be provided for their child.

(c) School-Based Admissions and Release Committee. The membership of the School-Based Admissions and Release Committee (SBARC) shall consist of:

1. Building principal, chairperson.
2. Referring teacher(s).
3. Teacher(s) of exceptional children.
4. Parent(s) of the referred pupil or their designee (at parent's discretion).
5. Consulting members providing input into the referred pupil's educational program (i.e. guidance counselor, psychometrist, psychologist, school nurse, school social worker, etc.).

(d) The functions of the SBARC shall include the following:

1. Receive referrals on pupils currently enrolled in the school thought to need special educational services and/or programs.

2. Follow due process procedures to insure that exceptional children and their parents are guaranteed procedural safeguards in decisions regarding identification, evaluation, and educational placement.

3. Conduct or obtain appropriate evaluations on referred pupils.

4. Discuss results of formal and informal evaluations.

5. Make recommendations for appropriate services and/or programs for the referred pupil. These recommendations shall include a written summary in educationally relevant and common terms, of the referred pupil's special needs, offering explicit strategies for meeting such needs and stating criteria by which the effectiveness of such intervention strategies may be determined.

6. At least annually, review the placement of each exceptional child in the school in relation to his educational progress in that setting.

7. Refer cases where appropriate services are not available within the school to the AARC.

PROVIDING VOCATIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR ADOLESCENTS WITH SEVERE MULTIPLE HANDICAPS

Dr. Marc Gold
Research Associate Professor
Institute for Child Behavior and Development
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, Illinois

One of the things teacher-trainers are faced with, even more than in the past, is a recognition of the increasing variety of places where training or teaching can take place. It's implicit in our system and in our culture that the places where things are learned very often times differ from the places where those same things are done. We look at the world to decide what would be good to know, how to do this and how to do that. Then we set up some special environment to give people the skills they need. We don't take a five-year old and stick him in the library and say when you know how to read, come out. And, we don't put a person in a car on the Eisenhower Expressway and say when you know how to drive, come home. We acknowledge that, to efficiently and effectively give people skills, there are special places, special people, special materials and other things that we need. That's not only true for handicapped people, but for all of us.

The conditions that one needs to acquire the skills are much different than the variety of conditions under which one could utilize those skills once acquired. For a lot of the things in life, especially when one is very young, we call that school. It turns out that the more you look at school the more you begin to realize that those special environments, those special people, and those special circumstances cost as much as they buy.

The more special a learning environment you have, the further you have to go to find out if and how the behaviors you developed there can evidence themselves in the ultimate environment.

One of the problems that we've had with special classes is the whole issue of making them special and then finding that what we created there wasn't useable anywhere else. Sometimes even if we create nice environments we still end up with behaviors that are not visible outside of the specially created environment.

Then, what about the current bandwagon in education called mainstreaming? You are trying to train personnel to effectively work with individuals, some of whom find it difficult to learn. Do you train your personnel to work in a mainstreaming situation or in a segregated situation? Is mainstreaming good? It's a bandwagon, but that doesn't mean it's good. Education keeps climbing on and falling off bandwagons, from phonics to perceptual-motor learning, figure-ground and everything else. What about mainstreaming?

There are some things that would be really nice for them to know that could only be efficiently and effectively taught in a one-to-one situation. Even for normal or gifted people there are things that could most effectively be taught individually or in small, homogeneous groups. Other things could most efficiently and effectively be taught under larger group circumstances. And there are other things, that couldn't possibly be taught except in large group circumstances, like how to get along with a large group. How do you teach normal people, whoever they are, to develop a genuine understanding and appreciation for all varieties of people if they never get a chance to experience them? Most current mainstreaming activities are really forms of segregation. Small numbers of children receive less services than they received before. Normal students have an opportunity to experience them in a classroom where they receive no instructions, and come to the conclusion that they can't do much. That doesn't make much sense but it could. For example, every classroom, could be a class full of teachers. If you are teaching cooking, and someone has mainstreamed three mildly retarded young women into your class, you have a chance to teach a chunk of life that you've never had before. You can teach the students in your class not only everything they need to know about how to make a white sauce, because they will pick that up without you - but also how to help someone learn to make a white sauce that finds learning difficult.

If handled right, you have mainstreaming that genuinely results in the integration of normal students with people who find it difficult to learn, and students who don't find it difficult to learn, learn something that they never had a chance to learn before.

Curriculum is another issue. I use the word "curriculum" to mean what is taught, a list of the things that people should end up with when they're done. That's a fairly narrow definition. Curriculum is one of the most value-laden parts of the entire educational process. There is no logic or objectivity to decisions about what to teach. Further, we couldn't possibly create a list that could exist in two places successfully. The ability to use a public transportation system is just wonderful unless you live in southern Illinois. Because, they don't have one. The ability to cook a meal is valuable unless you live in a sheltered care home that has a policy that no residents are allowed in the kitchen.

The ability to get yourself up on a Sunday morning, shave and dress, get outside, walk three blocks to church, sit down and be quiet for an hour - that set of skills could be one of the most valuable ways to get into community life that you could possibly come up with in some communities for some people. That could be a play, a strategy in some towns. Really, you don't have to talk, not if you don't want to talk. And, in other places such skills couldn't possibly be of less value, because who notices. In a lot of churches in a lot of cities, you don't even know who's sitting next to you anyway.

Another recommendation is that teacher trainers put much more of their focus on understanding the value structures of the community where their students are going to live. In some urban areas very serious problems arise because teachers, living under one set of values, attempt to teach people to be successful in life, when the people they are teaching live under a completely different set of values.

We shouldn't take very seriously all of the attempts that have been made to provide teachers with a ready-made list of curriculum of what ought to be taught. You can gain a real sense of the community and begin to generate decisions about what the most meaningful things are for your students to learn.

When working with people with severe and profound learning problems, my own bias is that once you decide that they can learn, they will. People with severe profound learning problems can acquire a great deal of very sophisticated information, and use it effectively to get along in life. The training process in order for them to get along must be very powerful. It takes a long time to teach a person with an IQ of ten to earn the minimum wage or more, doing electronic circuit board assembly work. But when you do, he's your typical printed circuit board assembler.

When you recognize the energies, resources, and time needed to bring someone to criterion on whatever it is that you want them to learn, then you become more concerned about what you decide to teach them. Many programs working with people called trainable mentally retarded spend weeks teaching people to fill out a job application form. Something is pessimistic about that behavior. First of all, it is clear that the people are quite convinced that they are not going to teach their students to hold a job. Because if they do, how many times will they need to use that behavior? And, by the way, the form that they are handed may not even look like the ones they learned to complete.

What's the alternative? It's really very simple. The people with whom we are working, who have difficulty retaining that kind of information, can simply learn card presentation behavior. That can be taught very quickly. Retrieve a card that has basically all of the information that is needed, and a second card. The second card might look like this - the person might hand the card to the personnel officer. The card says "I have been told that there is a position here that does not require anyone to read or write. If that is not true, please hand this card back and I will leave. If it is true, please show me where the job is. I'll show you how I work and you fill out my form." An employer wouldn't be offended. That would be something he would respect, not something that was looked down upon. You can have it all on the card and could have spent the same time teaching another meaningful work task needed out in the community. The whole issue of what to teach becomes much more critical as you move into training individuals who find it difficult to learn.

The focus of attention for teacher training programs, then, should be on the process of helping people acquire information, knowledge, and skills, an understanding of teacher's own value structure going into the teaching situation, and, the dynamics that exist where people live, out of which can come some realistic decisions about what should be taught.

I think it is fair to say that your expectancies as vocational educators and as special educators are going to undergo some significant modifications in the next few years. That which you are going to come to believe as reasonable, minimal expectancies for people graduating from public education programs is going to be very much different in a few years than it is now.

Every industry has its lag. A lag between what is obviously capable of happening and what happens. We have as much lag as any other industry. What will happen is that some of you will turn out teachers that are more openminded than other teachers, more competent than other teachers. When they are finished, there will be an opportunity for other teachers to expect more of their students. I really think that. I don't think that is just wishful thinking. We see that happening in California now. We're seeing it in educational settings, institutions, sheltered workshops, and community living facilities. Changes in the ability to teach are generating major organizational changes. Let's look at how expectancies and learner performance can make organizations change.

Make a list of your severely and profoundly handicapped people. Sit down with a bunch of people and make a minimal list of the important things that they need to know, that you are going to obligate yourself to teach them. Now if you can't do that, why are you in business as a school? You ought to be able to make some sort of a committment that any student who comes through here is going to know these things.

I think you ought to have another list that says here are another 300 or 400 things from which to select, like a menu. For each student in your program select from that bigger list, the things that we are going to obligate ourselves to teach him. Let's say, from that basic list, you come up with 40 or 50 behaviors. Get out a red pen, go back through the list and put a red mark by each skill that you believe could only efficiently be taught in an individualized instruction situation. My guess is that you will have a lot of red marks. Maybe not if you're dealing with mildly handicapped children, but if you are dealing with severely and profoundly handicapped children, a lot of red marks. If you've got a lot of red marks on the sheet of the basic behaviors, how can you avoid individualizing instruction. You must individualize. The question isn't "Can I or can't I?" The question is "How do I?"

Here is an example using a school with 50 severely/progoundly handicapped children, and 4 teachers. Such a school has ratios of one to:twelve, twelve, thirteen and thirteen. Let's not change your staff, resources, or money. Let's just utilize existing resources. First of all, regroup. We're going to take one of the teachers and empty her room. So, we now have three teachers in three rooms servicing 50 severely/profoundly handicapped children, with ratios of one to:sixteen, seventeen, and seventeen. What can a teacher teach to twelve severely/profoundly handicapped children that she cannot teach to seventeen severely/profoundly handicapped children? The answer is nothing. Nothing from nothing leaves nothing. When you look at the circumstances under which classrooms exist now, where there

104

are severely and profoundly handicapped children of whatever ages, all you have to do is look for a moment and you can see. Nothing is happening. It's a babysitting service, it's frustrating and it takes a lot of money. It's too expensive for a babysitting service and nothing is going on. The teacher is sitting there with six people, working with one, hoping that the other five will please just sit quietly for a minute - that's not group instruction or individualized instruction, it's chaos.

Group instruction is when you simultaneously provide feedback to two or more people. Not one, and then one, and then one. That's not group instruction. So we haven't changed the classes by adding three or four kids to each class. We really haven't changed them at all.

If I were the principal of such a school, I would have assigned daily times for program development. You can do task analysis, you can do individualized instructional planning, and your area is daily living skills, or community living skills, or transportation, or mobility, or language, etc. I want you to take three or four behaviors from that list and design very powerful training strategies to do individualized instruction. If it takes you a month to do them, that's fine. If you need help in doing them, come to me. It's my responsibility to see that you get help. I'm taking all your excuses away. I am expecting you to teach all of those things to every person in this program.

Make your lessons last only five or six minutes and teach just a chunk of the task each lesson. For teaching somebody to put on a coat, it may be merely finding the label and getting it down on the floor. That may be the the whole first lesson. In an hours time you've taught six or eight or ten people which is about the number that you had before. Teacher I gets this

1 to 1 time from 8:30 to 10:00. Teacher 2 has time to plan and time to teach 1 to 1 from 10:00 to 11:30. (Teacher 1 takes her group) and 3 and 4 get the same. What you end up with, with no changes in antthing but attitude and a slight change in distribution, is 30 hours a week of individualized instruction that you never had before and it's not costing you a dime more than planned.

Now the threat of such a program is: if you are the principal of the school that has 30 hours a week of individualized instruction and planning time available, somebody better learn something. The way it is now, how can you - the principal - in good conscience hold your teachers responsible for major changes in the lives of their children. You can't. They don't have what they need to be able to do it - now with severely and profoundly handicapped kids. But, under good circumstances what could happen?

Things like this could happen. Under individualized circumstances someone could teach each child to respond appropriately to forms of communication. Declarative sentences such as: Stop. Start. Pick this up. Put this in this. And four or five other sentences. Those are sentences to which children without any language can actually learn to respond appropriately. Part of those actually require modeling; learning how to "Simon says", learning to do what the teacher does. Now, look what happens. If you have seventeen children, all of whom know how to respond appropriately to eight or ten verbal commands, it's no problem to come up with a list of things that could be learned. And, now what? Now you can sit down with a group instruction situation with 17 severely and profoundly handicapped students and teach them, because, now you have a way of simultaneously communicating with everybody, because you taught them what they needed explicitly in those lessons.

The last thing that I want to talk about is something that I don't think shows up often enough in conferences like this. These conferences, I feel, tend to exist at a level that is too far removed from why you say you are in existence. As personnel who are responsible for teacher training, I would like to spend the rest of the time here talking about the trainer/learner relationshiip. Remember I am using the word trainer to mean teacher, the word learner to mean student, and the relationship to be all of those situations where someone learns from someone else. I think the whole issue of the trainer/learner relationship is something that has just been put aside.

I was reading a quote the other day about someone that says, "You can't teach someone how to teach. You can only give him some skills to use with that which he already has." Those of you that have been around programs for normal individuals know that the more severely handicapped, the more likely it is that you will find some very powerfully reinforcing events with which to move people through different pieces of learning. So that when you get into wards and institutions, you find token economies and other kinds of reinforcement pay-off systems which have high success rates.

This is very popular in public school programs for disturbed and for culturally disadvantaged children. There have been many projects, some of them successful in certain ways that have developed extensive systems for using pay-off as the principal means of conveying what is wanted and if a person is in fact doing just that. It might be that you have felt the need to teach your teachers contingency management systems, to teach them behavior modification. In fact, there are useful things to be learned in those technologies and in those approaches.

I think, though, what those systems buy is very costly. So I would like to talk about the trainer/learner relationship and its relationship to instructional technology. I would like to start out by saying that we find the word influence to be an extremely discriptive word to describe all of those things that trainers do to learners. Trainers influence learners. They can influence them before the learner acts, while he is acting, or after he has acted. I can come over here as the trainer and say "Give me the pen." (Said with very little inflection). That's a form of influence. I have conveyed something. I have conveyed knowledge about what is to be done.

There's another form of influence. Let's look at it for a second. "GIVE ME THE PEN"! Let's try another form - "Give me the pen" (Said very gently and lovingly). What's the difference? The first form of influence that you saw had as its focus and attention the knowledge about the task itself. Clearly, my focus of attention was on the knowledge that was to be conveyed. When I said "GIVE ME THE PEN!" it is just as clear that my intent, my focus was on the affect, the emotion, the relationship (what I want or don't want, what one better or better not do) and that the focus is not on the information. The information is in the message. But the basic part of that message has very little to do with the pen. That is almost a side issue.

If you look at education, at rehabilitation, at most settings where there are people who have knowledge and who are involved in an interaction with people who do not, you almost invariably find all kinds of evidence in the technology being used, in the control systems being used to suggest a superior-inferior relationship. I think that is wrong. I don't think there is a superior-inferior relationship. So sometimes when you get into these superior-inferior relationships, in these attempts to purchase what you want, there is a very intricate buy and sell system going on in both directions. And when you are working with severely handicapped people they don't have much of a chance to get their own side of the system going.

If your focus of attention relies very heavily on their affect, on their motivation, on their emotions, or getting them to want to, or to not want to, or to be glad that you are glad that they're glad, etc., your focus of attention is there. First of all, you fantastically clutter the learning circumstances. Good. I like that. Fine. That's really nice. That's really good. He's probably sitting there and saying, "If she would just be quiet, maybe I could figure this out."

But, what if I am sitting and working with a student and occasionally positioned her hand in reference to the task and the rest of the time I sat there silently while she proceeded. If she knows that I am paying attention to her and I am not off drinking coffee or fooling around, then she's sitting there saying, "If he's watching me and standing there and not saying anything, then I must be doing fine." That produces a good feeling. No news is good news, if I know that the news is available. Then, after three or four minutes I say, "That's going very nicely." Wow, after all that silence that's a nice thing. That really gets home. But not if it is sitting there in a barrage of junk. That barrage of junk does some things, too. When your focus of attention is on motivational and affective kinds of conveying of influence, you are much less likely to provide any meaningful information about the task. When I say to her "Good, Okay, good work. Oh good. Lovely work." Where is the information? If I say to her, "Place your right hand at the upper right-hand corner of the paper." That's it.

Now let's go a step deeper. What happens to the trainer when the focus of attention is on the kind of influence that focuses on the task itself? One of the things that happens is that you suddenly realize that you are working with a person, not an object to be manipulated. He begins to recognize that the person with whom he is working is a recipient of knowledge, not an object to be bought and sold and manipulated and controlled. When you come to that conclusion, then all of a sudden your entire relationship with that person changes. The superior-inferior relationship suddenly doesn't make a lot of sense anymore. Students are not things to be manipulated through life - to be coerced, controlled, and bought and sold. They are people, and with whom teachers can have a relationship that is free and clear of contractual kinds of interchange. Clear the air and focus on what needs to be learned and you'll find that the people learning from you will come to respect you exactly as much as you respect them. As that begins to grow, the variety of things that can be taught and the variety of opportunities for really meaningful teaching increases tremendously. Until it does the variety stays real narrow. So much of your time is spent with the buy and sell part of it that the actual nature of what you are trying to accomplish goes by unnoticed.

I said before that I thought it was important that you teach your students an awareness of their own values. I have not said in this presentation that reinforcers are bad, or that token economies are bad, or that buying is bad. I haven't said that and I don't mean that. I don't think they are. But, I think you have to recognize exactly what they cost and what they buy. Reinforcement systems can certainly have their place but for many of the people that you are teaching, remember - they may look good in front of you but unless they look good in front of everybody else who doesn't have those control systems, your control systems are costing you. They are costing you by lulling you into thinking that you have done something because they look so nice there. They may be looking nice because it's so painful if they don't. That's not education, that's social control.

I think the control systems we use, the instructional technologies we use, are more reflective of our value structure in the teaching profession than the statements we make about our value structures. When we closely examine the process of achieving success in teaching, many people in the teaching profession really do think they know it and somebody else doesn't. They really do think that they are superior and that their learners are inferior.

This one little suggestion that I make here, this last one, about beginning to focus on information about the task and beginning to deemphasize the focus on pay-off systems is an attempt to describe the kinds of instructional technologies that are more consistent with what we say our value structures are, than the instructional technologies we now use.

Some of you are familiar with the term normalization. Many of the programs that have the word "normalization" embossed in their labels are programs that go to every extent to control the lives of the people with whom they are working because they know what is best. That's the antithesis of the concept of normalization. What you can do with the students that you teach and you train, however painful and hard, is to go through the process of looking at the relationship between the techniques of working with children and what those techniques obviously say about what we must think about those children. I think as we get into working with more and more handicapped people, this need increases. When we work with individuals who have severe and profound handicapping conditions, we had better have our goals determined.

When you are working with severely and profoundly handicapped people, whether you like it or not, you control their lives. There is no way out; you do. You don't have any choice. You decide with whom they live and sleep; what and when they eat; as well as if and where they go. If that isn't controlling somebody's life, I don't know what is. If you are going to do that, as well-intentioned as you are, you are going to have to somehow get your value structures and the value structures of the people with whom you work, in solid shape. In this manner, both the teacher and the student(s) will have the appropriate goals and corresponding tasks in concert.

FROM THERE TO HERE: FLORIDA TEAM REPORT FROM THE ILLINOIS CONFERENCE

Mr. Pat Gardiner
Florida Learning Resource Center
Ocala, Florida

To give you a little background on the Illinois Conference: The reason the Floridian Consortium was born was to establish a working plan to develop a state planning, delivery and evaluation system for improving teacher education for those educators who work in vocational areas with the handicapped. This plan, a brainstorm of Dr. Stuart Schwartz, University of Florida, was to be submitted to the Illinois Conference for acceptance in order to be invited to the conference. This was done much in the same way as was done in order to be invited to the Kentucky conference.

This plan of the Consortium was to have several universities as well as the State Department and The Florida Learning Resources System (FLRS) join together in a statewide effort to reach as much of the state as possible with a model.

As for the Florida Learning Resources System (FLRS) which I represent, there are eighteen (18) such centers in the state of Florida, placed throughout the state in strategic locations in order to serve all sixty-seven (67) school districts within the state. The number of school districts each center serves varies according to population. All exceptional child programs and all exceptionalities are served by FLRS. We serve as a back-up system to these programs. Our main functions are: (1) program/information services, (2) media materials services, and (3) inservice training. You might say our services are used for teacher training. In the center of which I serve as Director, we have three (3) consultants. They have varied responsibilities, however, their main jobs are to service their particular counties - two each. They do this on a regular scheduled basis. Their function is to visit the classrooms of each teacher in our service area and provide service to that teacher. This is done with resources in media and materials, curriculum consultations, demonstrations, field testing and previewing commercial materials.

My center's emphasis is on vocational education for the handicapped. This is due mainly becuase of my interests in this field. When I started working with exceptional students it was in this area of teaching that I started. I started in 1968, about ten years ago. You might say that I am dedicated to this phase of their education.

Getting back to the formation of the Consortium. We thought about including the State Department for obvious reasons - money and clout. We thought that any time we needed something necessary to help us in our effort, the State Department people in the Consortium would be able to do just that. We included the Vocational Education Department of the State of Florida which provided the Consortium with their consultant for vocational education for the handicapped. With this cross-section of representation from over the state we thought our chances would be good for being one of the teams selected from over the nation. I would like to name the other members of the Consortium that worked so hard on this plan. They are: Dr. Bill Wargo, Florida State University; Dr. Jeanice Midgett, Florida Technological University; Dr. Jim Hensel, University of Florida; and Mr. Joel Corley, State Department of Education. This team put their heads together and came up with a plan which was titled "Action Plan".

I would at this time like to run over about five or six points of some of the things that we have done that came out of our plans. One of the big things was to do a needs assessment. Dr. Midgett had one already funded through the State Department so we plugged into that right away. Next we needed a dissemination system so the Florida Learning Resources System was used for this part of the plan. We used the newsletters of all centers (each center publishes approximately 600 per month for distribution) to publish articles of vocational education for special needs students as well as other information in this area such as: inservice training, research materials, and best practices from over the nation.

In particular, one article is publicizing five (5) booklets that will be coming out in the fall of 1978. Regular vocational teachers and administrators should be watching for these beneficial booklets. The titles are:

1. "Integration of Handicapped Students Into the Regular Vocational Education Program,"
2. "Vocational Education Characteristics of the Handicapped Learner,"
3. "Identification and Placement of a Handicapped Learner in a Vocational Setting,"
4. "Architectural Considerations and/or Modifications and Design in Use of the Instructional Setting," and
5. "Special Need Learners in Vocational Education Setting."

Dr. Robert Fowler is the Director of this federally funded project. His address is: Department of Special Education, University of Florida, Norman

Hall, Room 43, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

Another result of the Illinois Workshop was the impetus to present at other conferences. One in mind is the annual Vocational Conference for the State of Florida in Orlando, Florida. There the Consortium participated on a panel that was of a question and reaction type. This, I thought, turned out to be very functional as well as very informative. Then there are the three week seminars on Vocational Education for the Handicapped that are conducted by our Consortium members during the summers at Florida Technological University, Florida State University and the University of Florida. The emphasis of these seminars is to get more regular vocational teachers involved.

Reports to different conferences over the state, region and nation played an important role in carrying out our "Action Plans"; like this report that I am giving today and the one Dr. Midgette gave at the second Illinois Conference this year. We felt that one of our biggest accomplishments was working with the State Department in planning and implementing a state-wide workshop funded through the Mental Retardation Department and directed by Dr. Evelyn Syfrett, and assisted by Mrs. Eleanor Bates. The main objective of this state-wide effort was to inservice administrators, district supervisors, vocational rehabilative counselors, special education teachers and any other interested persons in forming and developing a district co-operative program in vocational programming for special needs students. Our keynote speaker was Dr. Gary Clark from the University of Kansas. This workshop was designed to complete eight (8) plans that would be functional and adaptive to large, medium, or small districts. Results should be forthcoming in the Fall of 1977. Such is the status of our "Action Plan" involvement thus far.

FROM THERE TO HERE: TEXAS TEAM REPORT FROM THE ILLINOIS CONFERENCE

Ms. Linda Parrish
Department of Inter-Disciplinary Education
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas

Dr. Mark Hull
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont

At Texas A and M, the vocational special needs personnel have adopted the logo "ENCOUNTER". This logo represents Establishing Networks for the Career Opportunities Unlimited Through Education and Rehabilitation. This is Project Encounter. We use advisory committees; something old for vocational education and a little new for special education in that our internal committees are departments of vocational education, special education, and adult education. Our external advisory committee consists of the state department, our learning resource centers, our MH-MR centers, and our rehabilitation vocational personnel that provide us with much good input.

We have four basic ENCOUNTER'S at Texas A and M and each is equal in product. They are as follows: (1) Research in Demonstration Encounter; (2) Campus Encounter, which is our undergraduate and graduate instruction; (3) Workshop Encounter, which encompasses our short-term training of teacher inservice; and (4) Service Encounter, which involves our technical assistance and efforts for our public service component.

To comply with recent legislation (PL 94-142, and sections 503 and 504 of the Rehabilitation Act), Project Encounter identifies a federal agency that is primarily responding to that legislation, and then the priorities of that agency become our adopted priorities. For example, for

PL 94-482 we have identified BOAE. We look at what BOAE's primary concerns are and then we make those our primary concerns. For example, one of the things that we have identified that BOAE has associated with 94-482 is "equal access". Then, we immediately wrote a research grant. This one is fresh off the press dated February, 1977. To go along with the concept of equal access the title is "Access Strategies for the Handicapped in Vocational Education".

Along with this research component, we use the experience we get out of the research to supply us with the growing edge that we feel we get for our training - our Campus Encounter. Some of you may be familiar with some of the things that have come out of Texas A & M. For example, a manual was published on "Procedures for Teaching Vocational Concepts to Students with Special Needs." This was a research project that we use on our campus as training material. We use it in another encounter in workshops. We can even use the experience that we have gained with public service in technical assistance in helping other people write various grants.

Another example of priorities BOAE suggested is inservice training for the handicapped. Out of this grew the Illinois Conference. Starting at the Illinois Conference, we took the concept home, and held a state conference in Austin, Texas, which is right down the road from College Station. The conference participants numbered 400. On the same stage we had people who had worked together for years who didn't know each other. We had the State Director of Vocational Education, General Education, Special Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Commissioner of Education all of the same state, and we asked them to pledge their committment to the vocational education/special education union. We taped it, so they can't get out of it. It was the first time that this had ever happened.

We not only had administrators, but public school people as well. The public school teachers who were there were the people who held our workshops. They showed us their programs and it was quite a learning experience for us. One participant was Mr. Reed Martin, who is an attorney that has spent much time with recent legislation and litigation relative to the implications of the laws. Other participants were Gary Clark from Kansas, Donn Brolin from Missouri, and Bill Eddy from Washington.

Regarding our strengths and weaknesses, I think I have covered our strengths by telling you what we have been able to do, but let me enumerate a few of them once again.

Our number one strength is our comprehensiveness. We feel as if we are covering all areas and not eliminating any. Another strength is our utilization of encounter components. The best one is that we have jumped at every opportunity to get involved. So much so that we are sacrificing a few other things. A major strength is that we are getting so much support from our Dean that it is just unbelievable. We have complete cooperation. Dr. Don Clark & Dr. Frank Hubert from Texas A and M are giving their utmost support. These factors have contributed heavily to our success rate.

Now to our weaknesses. Our very biggest weakness is that Texas A and M is a handicapped university. It is handicapped in the sense that we've only had women as regular students since 1971. Another area of concern is our rapid growth rate. Five years ago we only had 14,000 students and now we have 27,000. We have almost doubled our size in five years.

We are helping, and promoting, and growing, and we have a great deal of potential. Some of the ways we are doing this is evidenced by the fact that we are bringing in so many good people now at Texas A and M. One of the people with whom some of you are acquainted is Dr. Floyd McKinney, who came last year from the Kentucky State Department. He is doing a great job for us so we expect our program to be expanding tremendously.

Another weakness is that we are having to live with compromises. But, this is a conscious decision. We feel that such involvement will give us a clear understanding of what's needed and will ultimately help our programs to be stronger. Another weakness we feel is that sometimes it becomes a one-person effort. Dr. Mark Hull is our catalyst and a tireless advocate for the handicapped, but others must become committed to the cause. This last weakness I say very cautiously because I am extremely appreciative of all the states who have shared information with us at this conference.

I have learned so much from this conference, and I appreciate all who have been so open in sharing with us what has been done. I think we have learned a great deal. But, I must say, as someone already pointed out, we are being forced to reinvent the wheel. The reason we feel we are being forced to do so is because there are excellent programs in the United States, tremendous programs that we would like to model. But, because the originators of these programs choose to put them into commercial products, for which no one can blame them, we have a year to a year and one-half turnaround time in order to get these models. We really can't wait. It would throw our timetable off to wait on getting these materials. We can't wait to do that. We're having to reinvent some of the wheels that have already been invented perfectly. If we do decide to wait for them, which we haven't done, we would have to pay for them as well. They've been federally funded anyway. We think we need access to these models a little more readily.

Finally, we are facing hard realities of getting attitudes to be very positive towards working with the handicapped. We actively strive to get our students excited about the potentials of working with the handicapped. We also encourage inter-agency and inter-institutional sharing and cooperation.

SPECIAL VOCATIONAL NEEDS TEACHER COMPETENCY AND ENDORSEMENT: THE NEBRASKA CASE

Dr. Gary D. Meers
Director of Special Vocational Needs
Teacher Education
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Dr. Stanley F. Vasa
Associate Professor of Special Education
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

Overview of Special Vocational Needs in Nebraska

The passage of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 placed an increased emphasis on serving students with special needs, specifically, the disadvantaged and handicapped. The disadvantaged and handicapped were defined by the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 as:

(The term "disadvantaged" means) . . . persons other than handicapped persons defined in section 108(6) who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeding in the regular vocational education program . . . (Sec. 122 (a) (4) (A)).

The term "handicapped", when applied to persons in a special needs program, encompasses individuals who are mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons who by reason thereof require special education and related services. (Sec. 108(6).

In 1970 Congress established more inclusive definitions:

"Disadvantaged persons" means persons who have academic, socioeconomic, cultural, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in vocational education or consumer and homemaking programs designed for persons without such handicaps, and who for that reason require specially designed educational programs or related services. The term includes persons whose need for such programs or services results from poverty, neglect, delinquency, or cultural or linguistic isolation from the community at large but does not include physically or mentally handicapped persons unless such persons also suffer from the handicaps described in this paragraph.

"Handicapped persons" means mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, crippled, or other health impaired persons who by reason of their handicapping condition cannot succeed in vocational or consumer and homemaking education programs designed for persons without such handicaps, and who for that reason require special educational assistance or a modified vocational or consumer and homemaking education program.

These new and more specific congressional definitions gave the Nebraska State Department of Education's Vocational Division a renewed and more comprehensive charge to meet the unique and varied needs of all vocational students in the state.

In 1970 the first special vocational needs programs were initiated on a local program basis. The start was small as is any new movement with the programs involving one-teacher efforts scattered here and there throughout the state. The teachers were selected for participation in these programs by their expressed interest and desire to work with special needs students. The teachers in these programs were dedicated, enthusiastic, hardworking individuals who soon found that they lacked many of the foundational skills needed to work with this specific population. As the programs proliferated throughout the state during the next two years, more and more of these teachers started asking for specific skill training to better prepare them to meet the varied student needs.

In addition, these special vocational needs teachers wanted some type of documentation verifying their past academic endeavors and work interests in the area of special vocational needs.

Also, school superintendents and other hiring officials wanted something (some kind of record) that would indicate past work of a nature that would qualify teachers to work with special needs students.

These expressed needs could logically be met via course work, workshops, or seminars offered by teacher training institutions in conjunction with the State Department of Education. The first step of this implementation procedure called for review of the state's vocational plans section on teacher certification.

The Nebraska State Plan for Vocational Education requires that:

> Secondary teachers must possess a valid Nebraska Teaching Certificate. For vocational endorsement which qualifies teachers to teach in reimbursable vocational education programs in Nebraska, the following are required:
>
> 1. Course work in professional education should include a minimum of 12 hours in vocational education which may include 6 hours of student teaching in the major area of specialization, provided the student teaching is done in a vocational approvable program. If the student teaching is not in a vocational approvable program, then an additional 3 semester hours in vocational education should be involved.
>
>   a. Option #1

Student teaching in a vocational approved program (reimbursable)	6 hours
Professional vocational education courses	6 hours
TOTAL	12 hours

b. Option #2

Student teaching done in a non-approved vocational program	3 hours
Professional vocational education courses	9 hours
TOTAL	12 hours

2. Occupational experience in an employment situation which is in closely related occupations.

The only mention of special vocational needs teachers being made under heading 2 section d which states . . . that special vocational needs teachers do not need occupational work experience unless they are teaching a specific occupational job skill.

Since the state plan did not spell out specific certification requirements, a variety of methodologies could be explored that would provide the necessary experiences and skills for teachers of special needs students.

Special Vocational Needs Teacher Competency Development

The newness of the special vocational needs field and its lack of precedent-setting history forced those involved in the establishing of a teacher education program to look at related fields, innovative projects, and classroom teacher expertise.

A study team composed of State Department of Education officials, teacher educators, classroom teachers, and administrators was formed. This team decided to base its work upon competencies needed to work with special needs youth. They explored a number of competency-based projects such as the "Competency-Based Teacher Education Project" at Wayne State University and the "Vocational Education Competency Project" at Ohio State University.

Next, an intensive statewide survey was conducted to identify those competencies that in-service teachers felt were essential for teacher and student success.

Out of this work came seven major categories and one overall competency under each heading. Following each overall competency were sub-competencies that contribute to the overall preparation of a special vocational needs teacher.

These competencies are as follows:

I. Program Planning

A. Diagnose student needs within a vocational framework which is consistent with facilities available and occupational opportunities; and

Demonstrate a knowledge of vocational legislation, vocational funding, and vocational advisory committees.

1. Recognize special instructional problems associated with different rates of development.
2. Identify current issues and trends with respect to developing and implementing instructional programs for special needs students.
3. Utilize information obtained from related disciplines about the sensory, physical, emotional, social, and cognitive states of the student to plan remediation programs.
4. Conduct a task analysis of an instructional activity.

II. Curriculum Development

A. Plan course content, design instructional materials, and implement activities that are appropriate to the needs and interests of the individual student.

1. Translate the characteristics of a handicap or disadvantagement into behavior limitations.
2. Identify psychosocial effects of being handicapped or disadvantaged.
3. Deduct from behavior the qualitative differences in levels of cognitive functioning.
4. Describe instructional goals in performance terms.
5. Identify educational and behavioral goals in terms

of student's handicapping or disadvantaging condition.

6. Arrange educational objectives in order of priority.
7. Break down long-range educational goals into sequences of immediate goals.
8. Use information obtained from assessment activities, cumulative folders, and special reports to develop long-range educational objectives.
9. Define probable post-school vocational activities when developing long-range curricular objectives.
10. Utilize information obtained from related disciplines about the sensory, physical, emotional, social, and cognitive states of the student to plan remediation programs.
11. Generate instructional programs that are associated with the development of problem-solving behaviors.
12. Develop objectives in terms of entering behaviors of student.
13. Organize instructional environments that develop exploratory behaviors.
14. Aid student in defining goals and objectives that are achievable in terms of his limitations.
15. Design behavioral objectives for pupils, i.e. performance, cognitive, and expressive.
16. Design diagnostic pretest instruments for pupils.
17. Examine curriculum materials and specify how much materials have contributed to negative assumptions about minority pupils and their cultures, either by omission of data or inclusion of data which promotes a less than positive view of minority peoples.
18. Redesign curriculum materials that will promote a positive set of assumptions about minority students and their cultures.
19. Conduct inquiry-oriented programs which are culturally relevant to all pupils,
20. Conduct a program which emphasizes structure without losing proficiency and which can be applicable to all childrens' experiences.

21. Develop and conduct a program which will emphasize the multicultural nature of the society.

22. Design curriculum modules which relate to the multicultural population of the school and which provide ways for all pupils to gain positive identification of self-images.

23. Plan instructional programs that provide for the development of practical employment skills

III. Method of Instruction

A. Use appropriate instructional, motivational, and reinforcement techniques and instructional media which will result in an effective delivery system to the student.

1. Translate statements describing physical and sensory limitations into statements about instructional limitations.

2. Describe and evaluate the several theoretical instructional systems that are used to design programs for special needs students.

3. Translate learning theories in terms of functional relations to instruction.

4. Develop instructional materials to meet specific instructional needs.

5. Select instructional materials and methods in terms of student performance levels.

6. Involve students in instructional planning.

7. Sequence tasks to conform with learning styles, learning pace, and inferred learning potential of children.

8. Select teaching strategies and delivery systems.

9. Provide opportunities for independent study.

10. Reinforce exploratory responses and questions from students.

11. Provide success-producing stations for individual pupils.

12. Vary and pace instructional activities to maintain high student interest.

13. Demonstrate a variety of methods and techniques.

14. Use appropriate multi-media equipment and material.

15. Supervise student laboratory experiences.

16. Establish and demonstrate regular procedures for the safe use, storage, and maintenance of tools and equipment.

17. Adapt instructional environment for specific children in the light of information gained from physicians and other noninstructional consultants.

18. Establish order of business each day.

19. Define the operating rules and responsibilities of both the learner and the teacher-manager.

20. Encourage student to express his ideas and opinions.

21. Assist student to express his ideas and opinions.

22. Assist student to interpret his own behavior.

23. Use correct oral and written communication.

24. Administer diagnostic pretests to pupils.

25. Design teaching strategies in behavioral frameworks that will implement achievement of stated objectives based upon diagnosed strengths and weaknesses.

26. Conduct teaching strategies in behavioral frameworks that will result in achievement of objectives.

27. Select instructional materials that are necessary for the achievement of objectives.

28. Provide alternative learning routes for pupils.

29. Recycle pupils who do not reach the necessary mastery level for attainment of objectives.

30. Assess his/her impact on pupils and modify that impact by modifying teaching style.

31. Effectively use audio-visual equipment in the instructional program to develop instructional modules which relate to the lifestyles of all pupils.

IV. Evaluation

A. Select and use appropriate methods of evaluation which will reflect effectiveness of instruction and student accomplishment; and

Analyze and synthesize data from all relevant sources that will support program planning effectiveness.

1. Update program development and implementation in terms of current research.
2. Conduct follow-up activities on former students and provide assistance when necessary.
3. Maintain school records in objective fashion.
4. Select and/or develop appropriate assessment instruments.
5. Use assessment information as a basis for specifying behavioral objectives.
6. Observe and record behaviors elicited in assessment situations.
7. Tentatively identify student's preferred learning style.
8. Evaluate pupil performance at each step and task level.
9. Evaluate particular teaching process and strategies as related to individual pupil performance.
10. Compare the behavior outcomes of instructional efforts with stated long-term and short-term goals.
11. Evaluate and modify when appropriate his own teaching.
12. Evaluate diagnostic pretests in behavioral terms for pupils.
13. Communicate strengths and points of concern of pupils to parents and pupils.
14. Recycle pupils who do not reach the necessary mastery level for attainment of objectives.
15. Design post-test instruments to acquire data about achievement of objectives.
16. Evaluate post-test instruments data in conjunction with pre-test instruments data to assess effectiveness of

instructional materials and strategies.

17. Evaluate total learning environment in terms of its effects on pupil learning.

V. Guidance

A. Communicate occupational information and assist students in setting realistic goals in cooperation with other school staff and parents.

1. Identify probable activities for advanced education for individual students.

2. Describe a student's interaction with peers, teachers, and parents.

3. Aid student in accepting his handicap.

4. Work with guidance counselor to provide services.

5. Refer students to qualified personnel agencies and/or provide occupational and educational information.

6. Refer students to qualified agencies and/or provide assistance with personal, social, or scholastic problems.

7. Devise means of determining student attitude.

8. Give attention to the personal needs of the student.

9. Participate in student-parent conferences.

10. Encourage parents to implement extensions of school programs in the home.

11. Consult with the supportive teacher(s) in order to extend and implement programs for individual students.

12. Establish and maintain communication channels with personnel in school and community agencies to extend individual pupil instructional programs.

13. Work with professional consultants in developing programs for individual students.

14. Communicate with objectivity and specificity with other professionals.

15. Aid parents in defining realistic goals for their children.

VI. Human Relations

A. Demonstrate a personal concern for students and parents in all aspects of the educational experience.

1. Utilize behavior modification and other adjustment approaches.

2. Participate in student-parent conferences.

3. Describe purposes, programs, and goals of program to parents.

4. Obtain through counseling with parents information necessary for program planning and implementation.

5. Demonstrate a respect, love, empathy, for learners as growing, developing and feeling human beings.

6. Categorize behaviors which have led to negative assumptions about minority pupils and their cultures.

7. Categorize societal beliefs which have led to negative assumptions about minority pupils and their cultures.

8. Develop in pupils the social skills and values necessary for survival in the dominant culture without denying the existence of other values equally appropriate in minority cultures.

9. Differentiate between interpersonal relations with other staff members which have a negative effect on the teaching-learning process and those which lead toward positive change.

VII. Management of Learning and Behavior

A. Provide an atmosphere in which the student can work toward self-fulfillment in a school, home, community, and occupational setting.

1. Establish and maintain communication channels with personnel in school and community agencies to extend individual pupil instructional programs.

2. Develop and involve community resources as integral parts of the teaching-learning process.

3. Interpret the school's program to the community in terms both understandable and acceptable.

These competencies were reviewed and revised according to the recommendations of professionals involved in all aspects of the special vocational needs field. Analysis was made to determine where these competencies could be acquired, and it was determined that opportunity for acquirement was offered in other teacher education course work for all the competencies except for eight which required specific instructional effort. These eight are:

1. Recognize and evaluate special instructional problems associated with different rates of human development.

2. Identify educational and behavioral goals in terms of student's handicap and disadvantagement.

3. Adapt the physical and instructional environment for specific students within the sensory, physical, emotional, and social states in light of information gained from teachers, physicians, and noninstructional consultants.

4. Aid students in defining goals and objectives that are achievable in terms of his/her special limitations.

5. Assist students in understanding his/her limitations.

6. Refer special needs students to qualified personnel agencies and/or provide appropriate occupational and educational information.

7. Refer special needs students to qualified agencies and/or provide assistance with personal, social, or scholastic problems.

8. Aid parents of special needs students in defining realistic goals for their children.

The overriding premise of this competency development project was that the state had an opportunity to develop a teacher certification program that was free from past tradition, based upon expressed need, and oriented to a specific group of people having very real and pertinent restrictors in their lives.

Special Vocational Needs Teacher Education

In conjunction with the need for exposure to experiences that would lead to the competency acquirement as well as the aforementioned need for credentializing, a move was started to develop necessary courses in special vocational needs teacher education.

Out of this move came a nine-hour sequence of course work. These courses are:

> Introduction to Special Vocational Needs (3 hours). This is a general survey course designed for teachers of vocational handicapped and disadvantaged students. Emphasis is placed on determining the needs, interests, and abilities of special needs students. Exploration is made into meeting individualistic student needs.
>
> Development and Implementation of Special Vocational Needs Programs (3 hours). The primary concentration of this course is curriculum development and modification for students with special needs. Class participants develop curriculum materials for courses they teach within their field of specialization.
>
> Special Vocational Needs in Career Education (3 hours). Emphasis is placed on providing occupational and career information to students. A program of work is developed for integrating career information into all subject matter areas. Various approaches for assisting students in making realistic occupational choices are examined.
>
> Plus: Most of the teacher training institutions offer an optional fourth course that is field experience based. This is for variable credit of 1 to 3 hours.

The courses are offered on both the graduate and undergraduate levels and are open to vocational and general education students alike.

To meet the in-service needs of teachers throughout the state, two-day workshops have been conducted in various geographic regions so that all teachers will have the opportunity to attend. These workshops serve to introduce the teachers to the needs, interests, and desires of special needs students. Time is also spent exploring ways of modifying their present instructional units to better meet student needs. These workshops have proven to be very popular, and the number being offered have expanded every year.

Special Vocational Needs Teacher Endorsement

After offering these courses several times, it was felt that to lend more strength to the qualifications of individuals completing the sequence, an endorsement should be explored.

The first phase of this operation involved approaching the Nebraska Council on Teacher Education. This Council is the governing body for the state that makes educational decisions of this nature. The Council was receptive to the inquiry and asked that a committee be formed to answer three major questions:

1. Was there really a need for an endorsement?
2. How great was the need?
3. What should be the criteria for an endorsement?

A statewide committee composed of the members of the competency development team was appointed to investigate, synthesize, and respond to the questions raised by the Council.

Taking the previously mentioned competency list and the sequential course work as its base, the committee explored other sources of program input whereby special needs teachers could be exposed to the necessary experiences. As a result, course work from special education was included in the endorsement package. The endorsement package presented to the Council included the competencies plus a series of courses totaling fifteen semester hours. A Special

Vocational Needs Endorsement Program now entails the following:

Introduction to Special Vocational Needs (3 hours)
Development and Implementaion of Special Vocational Needs Programs (3 hours)
Special Vocational Needs in Career Education (3 hours)

Plus a faculty-student choice of the following to total fifteen hours:

Psychology of Exceptional Children (3 hours)
OR
General and Specific Learning Disabilities (3 hours)
OR
School Resource Personnel as Consultants (3 hours)
OR
Field Experience in Special Vocational Needs (1-3 hours)

With 135,000 students in the public schools of Nebraska in need of special needs programs and a severe shortage of teachers qualified to work with them, the question of whether there was a need for an endorsement in the area was easily answered to the Council's satisfaction. Also, at that time there were four hundred teachers involved in some phase of special vocational needs work without any credentials other than an overall secondary endorsement in their major field. They had no way of indicating, other than verbally, their willingness to work with these students. The Council felt that these figures indicated that there was a great need to proceed with the endorsement.

The question of criteria for the endorsement was readily answered via the previously developed competency work. These competencies clearly indicated to the Council what was expected of all teachers upon entering the field.

The State Director of Special Vocational Needs appeared before the Council in April, 1975, and presented the Committee's report and recommendations. In May, 1975, the Council granted approval to offer an endorsement in Special Vocational Needs.

To secure an endorsement, a teacher upon completion of the fifteen hours applies for an endorsement through his/her respective teacher training institution's certification officer. This person forwards the application to the State Department of Education Certification Office where the request is processed.

Four teacher training institutions are presently involved in the offering of these courses. These institutions are located throughout the state so that anyone in need of such a program can readily avail themselves of such an opportunity. Careful planning has been done to insure continuity of course work between institutions for purposes of program clarity and competency attainment. The Special Vocational Needs Endorsement is a multiphase endeavor in the state with the overall goal of providing educational experiences and strategies to teachers of this special population.

Results and Benefits Expected From Endorsement

It is anticipated that this endorsement will be reflective of well prepared teachers offering quality programs to meet the specific and individualistic needs of special needs youth.

Teachers that have been trained to work with these youth and can meet with success while in the classroom are much more receptive and willing to be leaders of innovative implementation practices that aid in the expansion of these programs.

The special needs youth who meets and finds an environment in which he/she can learn, be prepared, and subsequently find employment through the efforts of a qualified and understanding teacher will benefit througout his/her life.

Lastly, it is felt the endorsement will aid all school programs for all students because teachers with this endorsement will be more finely attuned to the needs of all youth and, thus, all involved individuals will benefit to a greater degree.

REACTION TEAM WORKSHOPS AND ACTIVITIES

Conference participants were organized into reaction teams (Appendix) and advised to partake in the workshop activities. Forms utilized during the sessions are presented in the Appendix section. Corresponding activities and participant responses are presented below.

WORKSHOP 1: ACTIVITY 1

Responsibilities of Service Deliverers

Considering a comprehensive secondary program of career education programming for the handicapped, what do you see as the responsibilities of the various service deliverers such as special needs vocational educator, regular vocational education teacher, special education work study coordinator, secondary special education teacher, etc. (list responsibilities by position).

Position	Responsibilities
A) Special Needs Vocational Educator	1) Student social and personal adjustment
	2) Individualizing curriculum
	3) Coordination of community resources and experience
	4) Modify vocational program to provide entry level employment
	5) Job orientation
	6) Teach basic living skills
	7) Assist student with exploration and choice of careers
	8) Consult with vocational education teacher relative to hadicapping condition and recommend instructional procedures as appropriate

Position	Responsibilities
	9) Provide special education teacher with assistance in career planning and exploration information
	10) Encourage and obtain public acceptance
B) Regular Vocational Education Teacher	1) Provide occupational competencies
	2) Provide career awareness
	3) Provide job analyses
	4) Identify minimum requirements for entering vocational training program
	5) Encourage public acceptance
	6) Interdisciplinary coordination and programming
	7) Identify resources
	8) Resource person for special education
	9) Monitor course changes as necessary relative to specific handicapping conditions
	10) Career planning
	11) Job counseling
	12) Occupational advocate
	13) Job-work evaluation criteria
	14) Progress reports
	15) Provide pre-vocational experiences
	16) Carry-out goals of IEP
	17) Work with parents
	18) Provide data for M-teams
C) Special Education Work Study Coordinator	1) Contact with employer
	2) Student placement

Position	Responsibilities
	3) Supervise training
	4) Articulate training with world of work
	5) Placement supervision
	6) Job and work related counseling
	7) Feedback and follow-up
	8) Trouble-shooter
	9) Revise curriculum as appropriate
	10) Liaison between work stations and school
	11) Provide career awareness
	12) Assure transportation
	13) Analyze needs of community occupational environment
	14) Public awareness
	15) Provide training in pre-vocational skill development
	16) Provide information to training program personnel
	17) Provide on-the-job supervision in conjunction with employer
	18) Coordinate employment and leisure time skills
	19) Relate work criteria from job
D) Secondary Special Education Teacher	1) Help design relevant IEP
	2) Work with parents
	3) Educational resource person
	4) Student advocate
	5) Relate teaching to work situation and evaluation

Position	Responsibilities
	6) Provide educators with information relative to various handicapping conditions and corresponding programming
	7) Provide academic evaluation
	8) Career awareness
	9) Self awareness
	10) Daily living skills
	11) Educate community
	12) Obtain appropriate support service
	13) Diagnostic evaluation
	14) Socialization skills
	15) Leisure time exploration and skill development
	16) Coordinate entire academic program
	17) Assist students to develop realistic goals
	18) Data and record keeping
	19) Management strategies
	20) Internal/external resources available for programming
	21) Professional ethics
	22) Values clarification
	23) Teach basic academic skills
E) Guidance Counselor	1) Identify students for referral to special programs
	2) Serve as resource to teachers of handicapped students
	3) Provide occupational information for teacher and student

Position	Responsibilities
	4) Serve as M-team member
	5) Assist in developing IEP
	6) Assist in planning the students' academic program
	7) Evaluate student progress in conjunction with staff
	8) Work with parents

WORKSHOP II: ACTIVITY I

Barrier Identification

What barriers can be identified as inhibiting the provision of preparation programs for handicapped students at the secondary/post-secondary level? (e.g., available training slots, teacher fear, lack of knowledge of legal mandates, etc.)

What might be done to eliminate each barrier?

What is the most appropriate source (persons, group, agency) for initiating action to eliminate the barriers?

Barriers	Elimination of Barriers	By Whom
1) Inadequate long term funding	Legislation at both state and federal levels to increase long-term funding	State and federal departments of education
2) Inflexible program training	Increase training options; pre- and in-service training; and dissemination of information about model programs	Teacher educators and departments of education
3) Administrative structure	Cooperative planning and M-team	M-team
4) Lack of cooperation of SEA	Communication of progress to state department	University and LEA
5) Lack of university cooperation	Higher levels of involvement in terms of community service	University and LEA

Barriers	Elimination of Barriers	By Whom
6) Categorical funding	Administration becoming knowledgable of available funds and procedures for procurements	LEA and SEA
7) Programmatic stigma	Audio-visual materials depicting successes of clients	LEA and SEA
8) Lack of program advocates	Involve parents and related community agencies	LEA
9) Lack of appropriate job sites	Work with employers and community to educate and promote acceptance	LEA
10) Teacher attitudes and values	Attitude and value clarification and raise expectation level	Teacher educators
11) State certification	Increase flexibility and awareness of staff of state certification offices	State departments of education/ certification
12) Architectural	Encourage legislation	All concerned
13) Lack of prepared teachers	Preservice and inservice	SEA and LEA
14) Teacher fears	Develop teacher competencies	Teacher training institutions
15) Lack of agreement on goals and methods of administration	Coordinate state plans at state level and emphasize concerns in advisory meetings	State departments of public instruction and all professionals
16) Lack of training materials	Encourage adaptation of present materials to meet the needs of the handicapped	LEA
17) Lack of standards to measure success	Require evaluation	LEA and SEA

WORKSHOP 11: ACTIVITY 11

Identification of Student Outcomes

Identify the major student outcomes sought through a comprehensive career education program for the handicapped, e.g., acquiring a job (reading want ads, making application for the job, participating in an interview, etc.).

List sub-components where you consider appropriate (in outline form).

Student Outcomes

1) Student skill abilities should match job market
    a) transfer of learning
    b) work endurance
2) Interpersonal relations appropriate to job setting
    a) punctuality
    b) feedback interpretation
    c) grooming
    d) safety skills and company rules
    e) appropriate physical contact
    f) break taking, lunch, and sick leave
3) Appropriate daily living skills
    a) punctuality and dress
    b) controlling emotions
    c) generalization
4) Seeking and utilizing personal support and advocacy
    a) transfer of learning skills
    b) feedback

Student Outcomes

5) Change in attitudes of non-handicapped

6) Value system

    a) consumer competencies

    b) good self concept

    c) salable skill

    d) discriminate qualities of work

7) Attain job entry level at completion of training

    a) flexibility of choices for initial employment

    b) job placement potential for all trainees completing program

8) Personal growth

    a) agencies available to assist worker

    b) development of marriage and family skills

    c) awareness of continuing educational opportunities

WORKSHOP III: ACTIVITY I

Service Delivery Functions

List the major Service Delivery Functions required to meet student needs, legislative mandates, and state or local regulations, preparation of the IEP, vocational assessment of students, pre-vocational orientation, etc. Task analyze each major function in terms of the skills and/or knowledge an individual should possess to adequately fulfill the requirements of the function.

Service Delivery Function	Function Competencies
A) Identify students in need of services	1) Knowledge of characteristics of potential population
	2) Utilize assessment techniques for meeting admission criteria
	3) Utilize supportive services and agencies
B) Evaluate the educational needs and interests of the student	1) Knowledge of formal evaluation techniques and procedures
	2) Ability to conduct formal and informal assessments
	3) Ability to identify educational impact of various handicapping conditions
	4) Ability to design educational programs to minimize effect of handicapping condition
	5) Ability to utilize all additional necessary resource persons who should be involved with special needs students
C) Survey Community resources	1) Ability to conduct and/or utilize manpower needs assessment procedures in communities

Service Delivery Functions	Function Competencies
	2) Ability to identify ancillary community resources and services
	3) Ability to establish and utilize advisory committees in the community
D) Curriculum development	1) Ability to translate educational task analyses into individual educational programs for sequential instruction
	2) Ability to develop and modify curriculum for the individual needs of the students
E) Instructional methodology	1) Ability to teach appropriate academic and daily living skills
	2) Knowledge of appropriate materials relative to pre-vocational skills
F) Facilities and equipment	1) Awareness of physical, learning and ambulatory needs
	2) Knowledge of appropriate equipment and utilization as well as services available
G) IEP development	1) Knowledge of the structure and function of an IEP
	2) Ability to utilize diagnostic tools to discriminate between goals, tasks, and skills needed or previously acquired
	3) Ability to develop appropriate instructional strategies
	4) Ability to evaluate learner progress
	5) Ability to involve and communicate with advisory team
	6) Awareness of due process procedures
	7) Ability to communicate with parents and child involved

Service Delivery Functions	Function Competencies
H) Evaluation	1) Awareness of specific diagnostic tools used for gathering assessment information
	2) Ability to interpret diagnostic data collected
	3) Awareness and utilization of supportive personnel in the development of an appropriate IEP
	4) Awareness of data collection techniques for teacher, student, and program evaluation
I) Work experience	1) Knowledge of specific competencies needed for student success
	2) Knowledge of community needs
	3) Knowledge of individual student needs
J) Job placement	1) Ability to develop jobs for students
	2) Awareness of job openings
	3) Conduct a task analysis for a given job
	4) Coordinate on-the-job experiences of each student
	5) Develop job-getting skills
	6) Coordinate supportive services
	7) Conduct follow-up placements and evaluate effectiveness
K) Accountability activities	1) Ability to identify process objectives for program
	2) Ability to audit effectiveness of process objectives
	3) Maintain records on follow-up status of students who have completed the program
	4) Collect and analyze data on student outcome

WORKSHOP 111: ACTIVITY 11

Refinement of Service Delivery Responsibilities

Considering the lists of Student Outcomes (Workshop 11: Activity 11) and the Service Delivery Functions (Workshop 111: Activity 1), discuss and appropriately revise the positions/position responsibility lists generated in Workshop 1.

Position	Responsibilities
A) Special Needs Vocational Education Teacher	1) Provide job orientation
	2) Teach entry level skills for work
	3) M-team member
	4) Teach basic living skills
B) Special Needs Career Vocational Education Specialist	1) Responsible for interdisciplinary cooperation in programming
	2) Maintains a file on the special student; coordinates job placement and follow-up
	3) Coordinate the adolescent special needs individual career/vocational program and provide pre-vocational instruction
	4) Resource person for special educational and vocational skill instructors
	5) Conducts and coordinates developmental career activities and assessments
	6) Responsible for appropriate referrals for personal, social, and daily living skills
	7) M-team member
	8) Knowledgeable of legislation, labor, and employment for the handicapped
C) Regular Vocational Education Teacher	1) Teach work or job skills
	2) Task analyses as basis for interdisciplinary coordination and programming

Position	Responsibilities
	3) Resource team member
	4) Modify content and/or method as needed to meet special needs of students
D) Special Education Work Study Coordinator	1) Identify job openings for on-the-job training
	2) Responsible for job placement
	3) Liaison between work stations and school
	4) Coordinate cooperative academic programming activities and job responsibilities
	5) Serve as resource team member
E) Secondary Special Education Teacher	1) Teach basic functional academic skills
	2) Resource team member
	3) Work with parents
F) Special Needs Counselor	1) Identify students for referral to special program
	2) Serve as a resource person to the teacer and student
	3) Provide occupational information for the teacher and student
	4) Serve as a team member on a committee for planning the students' programs
	5) Evaluate the progress of the students
	6) Identify job placements for on the job training
	7) Coordinate school learning activities and job responsibilities
	8) Identify work stations
	9) Liaison between work stations and the school

Position	Responsibilities
G) Guidance Counselor	1) Identify students for referral to special programs
	2) Assist in evaluating the progress of the student with reference to the objective stated
	3) Serve as a resourse person to the teacher of handicapped students as well as the regular teachers
	4) Serve as a team member on a committee for planning the student's program
H) Administrator	1) Carry out school board policies and state mandates
	2) Secure physical facilities
	3) Identify population to be served
	4) Prepare budget
	5) Secure personnel
	6) File reports
	7) Resource for funding

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

157

Conference Evaluation

Introduction

The evaluation tool, a questionnaire (Appendix), was designed as a feedback mechanism for the conference planners. It was distributed at the close of the conference and persons attending were asked to relate their perceptions of the conference functions and activities.

Part 1

There were thirteen (13) items of concern (Table 1) which had six (6) possible ratings ranging from very inadequate (-3) to very adequate (+3). For purposes of reporting these data, ratings are recorded as percentage responses in three groups: very inadequate (-3,-2), adequate (-1,+1), and very adequate (+2,+3).

TABLE 1

Conference Aspects	Percentage Response Ratings		
	Very Inadequate (-3,-2)	Adequate (-1,+1)	Very Adequate (+2,+3)
1) Conference objectives clear	4	34	62
2) Conference objectives appropriate for needs	2	26	72
3) Content appropriate for meeting objectives	2	34	64
4) Conference objectives were met	0	24	76
5) Media appropriate for transmitting content	2	16	82
6) Media technically sound	0	14	86
7) Materials helpful for learning	0	12	88
8) Conference staff helpful for learning	0	4	96
9) Group sizes appropriate	0	6	94
10) Group dynamics helpful to learning	2	8	90
11) Conference evaluation procedures unobtrusive	4	10	86
12) Overall content helpful professionally	2	12	86
13) Overall pace of conference appropriate	2	16	82

Other than viewing the percentage ratings as very inadequate, adequate, or very adequate, an alternative approach (Table 2) would be to view the data in terms of being negative (-3,-2,-1) or positive (+1,+2,+3).

TABLE 2

Conference Aspects	Percentage Response Ratings Negative (-3,-2,-1)	 Positive (+1,+2,+3)
1) Conference objectives clear	12	88
2) Conference objectives appropriate for needs	8	92
3) Content appropriate for meeting objectives	6	94
4) Conference objectives were met	0	100
5) Media appropriate for transmitting content	4	96
6) Media technically sound	2	98
7) Materials helpful for learning	0	100
8) Conference staff helpful to learning	0	100
9) Group sizes appropriate	0	100
10) Group dynamics helpful to learning	4	96
11) Conference evaluation procedures unobtrusive	4	96
12) Overall content helpful professionally	4	96
13) Overall pace of conference appropriate	2	98

Discussion

As reflected by the data reported in Tables 1 and 2, there was strong agreement that the overall objectives of the conference were met very adequately. Ratings that were negative or very inadequate were nearly nonexistent and ratings that were positive or very adequate were extremely high, with a range of 62 to 100 percent, a mean of 89 percent and a median of 93 percent. Relative to the aspects of the total conference, participants were advised to supply any comments and/or suggestions which would provide extended feedback to the conference planners. A listing of re-marks is presented in the Appendix section.

Part II

Eleven(11) conference sessions and activities were also rated preferentially according to the overall conference. Briefly, the eleven sessions were: the keynote address, legislation, implications of legislation, individualized educational plans, vocational preparation, Illinois conference team reports, workshops one, two, and three, institutional team planning, and reaction groups.

Discussion:

Generally, the presentations were ranked highest of all activities with responses reflecting overwhelming preferences for two particular presentations: "Providing Vocational Preparation for the Severely Multiply Handicapped" by Dr. Gold, and the conference keynote address by Dr. Hoyt. The institutional team planning and the reaction groups were ranked lowest, with workshops receiving the middle rankings. However, it is interesting to note that the workshops received more first priority ratings than the other conference agenda, with the exceptions of the presentations by Drs. Gold and Hoyt.

Part III

Four optional sessions were available to those attending the conference. The sessions included: a film theatre featuring films of reaearch conducted by Dr. Gold, a slide-tape presentation relative to PL 94-142, teacher certification, and federal priorities for career education and the handicapped. Respondents were asked to declare whether or not the sessions were worthwhile.

Discussion:

Although optional, most participants chose to attend a session. Of those attending the conference, 90 percent attended the optional sessions. The session which drew the largest attendance was the film theatre. Forty percent of the respondents attended that session and, of that group, 95 percent rated it as worthwhile. The second most popular session was that dealing with federal priorities, with 86 percent rating it as worthwhile. The session on certification was third, followed by the slide-tape presentation about PL 94-142. All respondents who attended these sessions rated them as worthwhile.

Conclusions:

The data suggest that the conference was very adequate for the needs of those in attendance. Conference personnel, group sizes, and group dynamkcs were evaluated as very adequate. Two of the eleven sessions were evaluated as very outstanding (Gold, Hoyt), with none of the sessions being evaluated as very inadequate. Conference objectives received some negative ratings, but were still considered very adequate overall. Positive participant interest was further substantiated by the fact that 90 percent of the people attended optional, evening sessions. Those sessions were rated as worthwhile and helpful by nearly every participant.

FOLLOW-UP EVALUATION

162

Follow-Up Evaluation

Introduction

The Team Follow-Up Questionnaire (Appendix) was designed as a feedback mechanism relative to the activities partaken by team members at their respective universities. This questionnaire was distributed under separate cover and conference team members were asked to jointly respond. Comments relative to the questionnaire items are presented in the Appendix section.

Part 1

There were development activities in number from 1 to 10a. Of concern was the status of each activity in terms of functional operation at participant universities. Status responses to the development activities as reported by the participant teams are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Course/Program Development Concerning Career Education Programming for Special Education Students

	Status (Percent Responses)				
Development Activities	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken
1) Identification of teacher competencies for career education programming of secondary education students	15	23	35	19	08
2) Advisory/steering committee for course development	16	16	28	12	28
3a) Proposal for introductory preservice or inservice course	27	19	27	19	08

	Development Activities	Status (Percent Responses)				
		In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken
b)	Presentation of proposal for introductory course to appropriate curriculum approving committee	29	04	17	25	25
4a)	Proposal for advanced (e.g., methods) course for preservice or inservice	25	13	20	13	29
b)	Presentation of proposal for advanced course to appropriate curriculum approving committees	17	08	17	13	45
5)	Procurement of resource materials for teaching courses/workshop	28	08	20	32	12
6)	Evaluation/revision of present courses or programs	12	12	32	32	12
7)	Advisory/steering committee for degree program	13	00	13	09	65
8a)	Development of proposal for undergraduate program	17	04	17	08	54
b)	Submission of proposal for undergrad degree program for approval	17	00	17	08	58
9a)	Development of proposal for graduate degree program	12	12	12	08	56
b)	Submission of proposal for graduate degree program for approval	08	08	04	08	72
10a)	Development and presentation of workshop (with objectives, corresponding materials, and so forth) concerning career education programming for special education students	17	13	04	53	13

Discussion

As reflected by the data reported in Table 1, the development activities that were in existence prior to the workshop and receiving the most percentage responses were items directly related to preservice and inservice. This status had a range of 8 to 29 percent, a mean of 18 percent and a median of 17 percent. Ranked lowest was area of degree programming.

The activities that were in the planning stage prior to the workshop had a range of 0 to 23 percent, a mean of 10 percent, and a median of 10 percent. Ranking highest in this status group were concerns of identification of teacher competencies and course development. Ranking lowest of this status group were areas relative to degree programs.

Regarding the activities that were in the planning stage since the workshop, this status group had a range of 4 to 35 percent, a mean of 19 percent and a median of 17 percent. Ranking highest in this group were areas of identification of teacher competencies, evaluation of existing courses, and course development. Ranking lowest was the area of graduate degree programming.

The fourth status group relative to the development activities was in reference to those having been implemented or completed since the workshop. This group had a range of 8 to 35 percent, a mean of 18.5 percent, and a median of 13 percent. Of particular note is the area of participation in conferences. This area ranked the highest by far. Ranking lowest in this group were the areas related to degree programming.

The final status group was one wherein no action had been taken. This group had a range of 8 to 72 percent, a mean of 32.5 percent, and a median of 28.5 percent. Ranking highest in this "no action taken" group were areas directed toward degree programs. Ranked lowest were areas of identification of teacher competencies and introductory preservice or inservice courses.

Conclusion (Part 1)

The data as discussed suggest that areas of action were primarily consistent throughout all status groups. These action areas were: preservice and inservice, identification of teacher competencies, course evaluation and development, and participation in conferences and workshops. The area of utmost inactivity as reported by participant teams in all status groups was that of degree programming. Little has been done in terms of developing personnel preparation degree programs concerning career education for special education students.

Part 2

Participant teams were advised to respond to questionnaire items relative to personnel preparation staff (Table 2) for courses/programs concerning career education programming for special education students.

Discussion

As reflected by the data reported in Table 2, the program staff activities in existence prior to the workshop and receiving the highest ranking were faculty competencies as evaluated and job descriptions of desired positions. Ranking lowest was the area of search committees for positions. This status group had a range of 13 to 25 percent, a mean of 21 percent and a median of 25 percent.

TABLE 2

Staff to Implement Courses and/or Program(s) Relative to Career Education Programming for Special Education Students

Program Staff Activities	Status (Percentage Responses				
	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken
1. Present faculty competencies evaluated	25	04	25	21	25
2. Job description of position(s) desired	25	00	04	17	54
3. Search committee(s) for position(s)	13	00	00	17	70

The program staff activities in the planning stage prior to the workshop had a range of 0 to 4 percent, a mean of 1.3 percent, and a median of 0 percent. The only activity in planning prior to the workshop was the search committee for positions, and same was nearly nonexistent.

The activities in planning since the workshop had a range of 0 to 25 percent, a mean of 9.7 percent, and a median of 4 percent. This status group reflects the greatest activity in the area of search committees for positions. Responses to the activities which were implemented or completed since the workshop were evenly distributed. The range was 17 to 21 percent, the mean was 18.3 percent, and the median was 17 percent. All areas were reportedly active.

Again, the final status group was one wherein no action had been taken. This group had a range of 25 to 70 percent, a mean of 49.7 percent, and a median of 54 percent. Ranking highest in this "no action taken" group were areas of search committees and job descriptions. Ranking lowest was the area of faculty competencies as evaluated.

Conclusion (Part 2)

The "no action taken" status group had scores that equaled or exceeded all other reported scores in this part. The remaining other scores suggested that staff activities were generally in existence prior to the conference or have since been implemented.

Part 3

Funding of activities as well as sources of funding were of particular concern. Table 3 presents percent responses to funding activities in terms of status and sources.

Discussion (Status)

The funding activities in existence prior to the workshop had a range of 21 to 29 percent, a mean of 24.75 percent, and a median of 24.5 percent. All areas of funding were in existence prior to the conference.

TABLE 3

Exploration of Funding Sources for Career Education Programming for Special Needs Students

Funding Activities	Status					Source		
	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Local/ University	State	National
1. Inservice Workshops	23	18	18	18	23	36	36	28
2. Research	29	12	12	12	35	30	35	35
3. Curriculum development	21	21	11	11	36	30	35	35
4. Planning committee meetings	26	16	21	05	32	43	43	14

Regarding the funding activities that were in the planning stage prior to the workshops, this status group had a range of 12 to 21 percent, a mean of 16.75 percent, and a median of 17 percent. All areas were in planning stage prior to workshop.

Since the workshop, planning for funding has taken place with scores ranging from 11 to 21 percent, a mean of 15.5 percent, and a median of 16 percent. Ranking highest of these areas was committee meetings. Ranking lowest was the area of curriculum development.

The activities that have been implemented or completed since the workshop have primarily been conferences. The lowest rating was for committee meetings. This group had a range of 5 to 18 percent, a mean of 11.5 percent, and a median of 11.5 percent.

The "no action taken" group again surpassed the relative scores of the other groups. The range was from 23 to 36 percent, a mean of 31.5 percent, and a median of 33.5 percent. Ranking highest were areas of curriculum development and research. Ranking lowest was inservice workshops.

Discussion (Source)

The activities that were supported by local/university funds ranged in percent responses from 30 to 43 percent, had a mean of 34.75 percent, and a median of 33 percent. The area receiving the most response relative to local/university funding was committee meetings. The lowest ranking areas were research and curriculum development.

The activities that were supported by state funds ranged in percent responses from 35 to 43 percent, had a mean of 37.25 percent, and a median of 35.5 percent. All areas were closely distributed, however committee meetings again ranked highest.

In terms of being supported by national funds, the responses ranged from 14 to 35 percent, had a mean of 28 percent, and a median of 32 percent. This group had the lowest number of total responses. Rated highest in terms of national funding were the areas of research and curriculum development. Rated lowest was the area of committee meetings.

Conclusion (Status and Source)

All areas of funding were in existence throughout planning and implementation stages both prior to and since the workshop. However, the largest individual percentage responses were in the "no action taken" group.

The data reported suggest that curriculum development, research and inservice workshops generally receive equal funds from local/university, state, and national components. However, planning committee meetings are generally funded more heavily from local/university and state funds, with little support from national funds.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

172

Conference on Career Education for the Handicapped
March 15-18, 1977
Lexington, Kentucky

Invited Conference Teams

1. Dr. Thomas R. Sunnarborg
Coordinator, Vocational Teacher Education
Bemidji State University
Bemidji, MN 56601
(218) 755-2953

Dr. Dean Konopasek
SLPB Coordinator
Bemidji State University
Bemidji, MN 56601
(218) 755-2781

2. Dr. Robert A. Stodden
College of Education
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MASS 02167
(617) 969-0100, ex.4180

Dr. Tom Hehir
College of Education
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, MASS 02167
(617) 366-5891

3. Mr. Ronald H. Day
Vocational - Technical Education
Chadron State College
Chadron, Nebraska 69337
(308) 432-4451, ex. 369

Dr. John E. Dunn
Education and Psychology
Chadron State College
Chadron, Nebraska 69337
(308) 432-4451, ex. 335

Dr. Merlyn Gramberg
Vocational-Technical Education
Chadron State College
Chadron, Nebraska 69337
(308) 432-4451, ex. 371

4. Dr. Wayne L. Sengstock
Dept. Special Education
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 658-2312

Dr. Fred Otte
Vocational & Career Ed. Dept.
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 658-2500

5. Dr. George E. Colyer
Dept. of Special Education
West Georgia College
Carrollton, GA 30117
(404) 834-1332

Dr. James J. Rohrbach
Dept. of Special Education
West Georgia College
Carrollton, GA 30117
(404) 834-1302

6. Dr. Gerald L. Ognibene
Dept. of Special Education
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, NJ 08028
(609) 445-7095

Dr. Donald Anderson
Dept. of Vocational Education
Glassboro State College
Glassboro, NJ 08028
(609) 445-6209

7. Dr. Lee Parks
College of Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6150

Dr. Jack Kaufman
College of Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, ID 83843
(208) 885-6556

Drs. Ken and Dianne Hickey
College of Education
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho
(208) 885-6150

8. Dr. Gary E. Lintereur
Dept. of Ind. & Tech. Ed.
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
(815) 753-0516

Dr. Sidney Miller
Department of Special Education
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115
(815) 753-0656

9. Dr. Samuel Price
College of Education
Illinois State University
Normal, ILL 61761
(309) 438-2273

Dr. R. D. Blomgren
College of Education
Illinois State University
Normal, ILL 61761

10. Dr. Norma Ewing
Dept. of Special Education
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, ILL 62901
(618) 453-2311

Dr. RoseMary Carter
Home Economics Bldg.
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, ILL 62901
(618) 453-2534

11. Dr. Paul Retish
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
(319) 353-5836

Dr. David Jepsen
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
(319) 353-3371

12. Dr. Bob Ohlsen, Jr.
Holton Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66502

Dr. E. Lynn Hausmann
Holton Hall
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66502
(913) 532-5797

13. Dr. Billie T. Radar
313 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
(517) 355-5274

Dr. Bert Donaldson
336 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

14. Dr. Thomas A. Wood
Special Education Department
College of Education
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071

Dr. Paul Lyons
Vocational - Technical Education
College of Education
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42701
(502) 762-3392

Dr. Larry Marrs
Special Education Department
College of Education
Murray State University
Murray, KY 42071
(502) 762-2446

Dr. Doris Helge
CID - HDL
Murray State College
Murray, KY 42071
(502) 762-3817

15. Dr. Dennis C. Nystrom
College of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40208
(502) 588-6667

Dr. Marvin Holmes
College of Education
University of Louisville
Louisville, KY 40208
(502) 588-6421

16. Dr. Joseph P. Price
Dept. of Special Education
College of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
(313) 763-2374

Dr. John Odbent
Department of Vocational Ed.
College of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
(313) 764-8423

Ms. Lynne Cook
Dept. of Special Education
College of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
(313) 763-2374

Dr. Julius Cohen
Deputy Director
Institute for Study of Retardation and Related Disabilities
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
(313) 763-3171

17. Dr. Leonard Cloninger
117 H Kayser Hall
P.O. Box 688
University of Nebraska
Omaha, Nebraska 68101
(402) 554-2201

Dr. Carl Clous
414 F Kayser Hall
P.O. 688
University of Nebraska
Omaha, Nebraska 68101
(402) 554-2721

18. Dr. William H. Kern
SKIL, K. Hamilton Mental Health Center
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IND 47809
(812) 232-1181

Dr. Sue Wolf
SKIL, K. Hamilton Mental Health Center
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IND 47809
(812) 232-1181

19. Dr. T. R. Tower
College of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 89507
(702) 784-4961

Dr. Ivan E. Lee
College of Education
University of Nevada
Reno, NV 98507
(702) 784-4961

20. Dr. Joseph R. Clary
Box 5096
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27607
(919) 737-2234

Dr. Cathy Mahmoud
Box 5096
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27607
(919) 737-3221

21. Dr. Charles Morrill
New Hampshire Vocational Technical College
Claremont, NH 03743
(603) 542-7744

Dr. Olouse Tullos
New Hampshire Vocational Technical College
Claremont, NH 03743
(603) 542-7744

22. Dr. Helen Lindsey
College of Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074

Dr. Wayne Lockwood
College of Education
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74074

Mr. Clyde Matthews
Oklahoma State Dept. of Vocational Tech. Ed.
Oklahoma City
Oklahoma 73100

23. Dr. Fred Welch
103 Rackley Building
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-8361

Dr. Gerald G. Robine
120 Special Education Bldg.
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-1304

24. Dr. David G. Goodman
College of Business and Economics
University of Wisconsin
Whitewater, WI 53190
(414) 472-4993

Dr. Heinz Pfaeffle
College of Education
University of Wisconsin
Whitewater, WI 53190
(414) 472-1100

Dr. Thomas S. McLeRoy
School of Continuing Education
University of Wisconsin
Whitewater, WI 53190
(414) 472-1100

25. Dr. Bob Brock
Director of Special Education
College of Education
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751
(715) 232-1409

Dr. Duane Johnson
College of Education
University of Wisconsin-Stout
Menomonie, WI 54751
(715) 232-1409

26. Dr. Ronald J. Kral
College of Education
University of Wisconsin
Eau Claire, WI 54701
(715) 836-4173

Dr. Bernard Holler
College of Education
University of Wisconsin
Eau Claire, WI 54701
(715) 836-4740

27. Dr. Alberta Lansdowne
Westfield State College
Westfield, MASS 01085
(413) 568-3311, ex. 326

Dr. George Worle
Westfield State College
Westfield, MASS 01085
(413) 568-3311, ex. 326

28. Dr. Norman Ehresman
College of Education
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

29. Dr. Gerald Bekker
College of Education
Northern Montana College
Havre, Montana 59510
(406) 265-7821, ex. 288

Dr. Ron Sexton
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101
(406) 657-2351

Dr. Elia G. Nickoloff
Eastern Montana College
Billings, Montana 59101

30. Mr. Pat Gardiner
Florida Learning Resources System
515 S.E. 8th Street
Ocala, FL 37670
(904) 732-4195

Dr. James Hensel
Vocational Tech. and Adult Ed.
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

31. Dr. Stan Vasa
Barkley Center
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NB 68588
(402) 472-3955

Dr. Gary Meers
105 Bancroft
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NB 68588
(402) 472-2365

32. Ms. Linda Parrish
College of Education
Dept. of Interdisciplinary Education
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas 77843

Dr. Mark Hull
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont 05602
(802) 828-3141

Conference on Career Education for the Handicapped
March 15-18, 1977
Lexington, Kentucky

Other Conference Participants

Dr. Melville Appell
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Regional Office Building, Room 3114
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-9836

Dr. Henry Colella, Asst. Superintendent
Nassau County Public Schools
Division of Special Education
Salisbury Center
Valentine Road and the Plain Road
Westbury, NY 15904

Mr. Pat Gardiner
Florida Learning Resources System
515 S.E. 8th Street
Ocala, FL 37670
(904) 732-4195

Dr. Marc Gold
Institute for Child Behavior and Development
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, ILL 61801
(217) 333-8285

Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director
Office of Career Education
United States Office of Education
7th and D. Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20202
(202) 245-9836

Dr. Gary Meers
105 Bancroft
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NB 68588
(402) 472-2365

Dr. Stan Vasa
Barkley Center
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, NB 68588
(402) 472-3955

Ms. Linda Parrish
College of Education
Dept. of Interdisciplinary Education
Texas A&M University
College Station, Texas 77843

Mr. Donald Miller
Graduate Student
Deptment of Vocational Education
College of Education
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506
(606) 258-5691

James Baker
Ky. State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KY 40610

Clyde Caudill
Ky. State Department of Education
Capital Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601

Robert Chenoweth
Assistant Attorney General
Ky. State Department of Education
Frankfort, KY 40601

Art Craig
Special Vocational Functions Unit
Kentucky Bureau of Vocational Education
Ky. State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601

J. W. Deese
Kentucky Bureau of Corrections
Frankfort, KY 40601

Gladys Pramuk
Dept. of Ed. Psych. & Counseling
College of Education, DH
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Billy R. Howard
Ky. State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601

Dr. Mark Hull
State Department of Education
Montpelier, Vermont
(802) 828-3141

Mrs. Carrie Ott
Division of Mental Retardation
Bureau of Ed. for Exceptional Children
Ky. State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KT 40601

Ms. Misha Phillips, Director
Child Service Demonstration Center
Bureau of Ed. for Exceptional Children
Ky. State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601

Ms. Donnalie Stratton, Director
Special Vocational Functions Unit
Ky. Bureau of Vocational Education
Ky. State Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Office Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601

Sue Adkins
Bluegrass School
Price Road
Lexington, KY 40508

Bobbie Anderson
Franklin County High School
Frankfort, KY 40601

Kristi Arnquist
Metro Industrial Services
1086 Brentwood Ct.
Lexington, KY 40511

J. C. Barrett
Illinois Office of Education - DAVTE
Springfield, ILL 62701

Becke Cleaver
Bluegrass School
Price Road
Lexington, KY 40508

Charles Muntz, Superintendent
Franklin County Schools
Frankfort, KY 40601

Ms. Carol Tackett
Pikeville College
Pikeville, KY 41501

Dr. Ed Blackhurst, Chairman
Dept. of Special Education
College of Education, TEB 224
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. Harold Binkley, Chairman
Dept. of Vocational Education
College of Education, DH 51
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. Pat Cegelka
Dept. of Special Education
College of Education, TEB 224
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Dr. Betsy Farley
College of Education
405 Bradley Hall
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Ms. Pat Hoessli, Graduate Student
Dept. of Special Education
College of Education, TEB 224
University of Kentucky 40506

Dr. Al Kennedy
Dept. of Vocational Education
College of Education, TEB 151
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky 40506

Dr. Carl Lamar
Dept. of Vocational Education
College of Education, DH 44
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. Al Phelps
Vocational Industrial Education
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802

Mr. Mark Mattmiller
Dept. of Special Education
College of Education, TEB
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Mr. Fred Myers
Dept. of Vocational Education
College of Education, DH 48
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. Clay Omvig
Dept. of Vocational Education
College of Education, DH 46
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Ms. Mavis Sparks
Special Education / ALRC
Porter Bldg., 125
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. Dennis Vinton
Seaton Bldg. 110-HPER
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506

Dr. James Hensel
Vocational, Technical, and Adult
Education
College of Education
University of Florida

APPENDIX A

REACTION TEAM ASSIGNMENTS

Team 1

Bemidji State
Georgia State University
Illinois State University
Western Kentucky University
Univ. of Nebraska - Omaha
Pennsylvania State Univ.
Univ. of Wisconsin - Stout

Team 2

Boston College
Glassboro State College
Indiana State University
University of Louisville
Univ. of Nevada - Reno
Texas A & M
University of Michigan

Team 3

Chadron State
University of Idaho
University of Iowa
Michigan State University
New Hampshire Voc. Tech. College
Westfield State College

Team 4

Florida Consortium
Northern Illinois University
Kansas State University
Northern Montana
North Carolina State Univ.
Univ. of Wisconsin - Eau Claire

Team 5

West Georgia College
Southern Illinois University
Murray State University
University of Nebraska
Oklahoma State University
Univ. of Wisconsin-Whitewater

State department and public agency officials should join the Reaction Team to which a funded institution from their state was assigned.

APPENDIX B

REATION TEAM WORKSHOP AND ACTIVITY FORMS

Group Leader ____________________________   Group No. ____________________

Page _____ of ____

WORKSHOP I: ACTIVITY I

RESPONSIBILITIES OF SERVICE DELIVERERS

Considering a comprehensive secondary program of career education programming for the handicapped, what do you see as the responsibilities of the various service deliverers such as special needs vocational educator, regular vocational education teacher, special education work study coordinator, secondary special education teacher, etc. (list responsibilities by position).

Positions	Position Responsibilities

Group Leader______________________________

Group No.______________________________

Page _____ of _____

WORKSHOP II: ACTIVITY I
Barrier Identification

1. What barriers can be identified as inhibiting the provision of preparation program for handicapped students at the secondary/post-secondary level? (e.g., available training slots, teacher fear, lack of knowledge of legal mandates, etc.)
2. What might be done to eliminate each barrier?
3. What is the most appropriate source (persons, group, agency) for initiating action to eliminate the barriers?

1. Barriers?	2. What might be done to eliminate barriers?	3. By whom?

Group Leader______________________ Group No:______________________

Page ______of_____

WORKSHOP II: ACTIVITY II

IDENTIFICATION OF STUDENT OUTCOMES

1. Identify the major student outcomes sought through a comprehensive career education program for the handicapped, e.g., acquiring a job (reading want ads, making application for the job, participating in an interview, etc.).

2. List sub-components where you consider appropriate (in outline form).

Student Outcomes
  -Sub componets

Group Leader______________________________

Group No.______________

Page_____of_____

WORKSHOP III: ACTIVITY I

1. List the major Service Delivery Functions required to meet student needs, legislative mandates, and state or local regulations, preparation of the IEP, vocational assessment of students, pre-vocational orientation, etc.
2. Task analyze each major function in terms of the skills and/or knowledge an individual should possess to adequately fulfill the requirements of the function.

Service Delivery Functions	Competencies Required to Achieve the Functi

Group Leader________________________________ Group No.________________

Page _______of________

WORKSHOP III-ACTIVITY II
REFINEMENT OF SERVICE DELIVERY RESPONSIBILITIES

Considering the lists of Student Outcomes (Workshop II: Activity II) and the Service Delivery Functions (Workshop III: Activity I), discuss and appropriately revise the positions/position responsibility lists generated in Workshop I.

Positions	Position Responsibilities

190

Group Leader____________________________

Group No.__________________________

Page __________of________pages

Activity Choice________________

Workshop III: Activity III

WORKSHOP III

SUPPLEMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Choose from among these as time permits.

1. List ideas of ways special and vocational teacher educators can work cooperatively in the preparation of teachers capable of performing the previously listed Service Delivery Functions and in the meeting of the Student Outcomes.

2. Look at the Student Outcomes List and the Service Delivery Functions List. Who at the local level should have responsibility to accomplish each? (indicate major, minor, or joint responsibility)

3. Again considering the two lists, who in teacher education should be providing what instruction to prepare teachers?

4. Identify common and unique responsibilities for the various positions identified.

Group No.____________________

Workshop_____________________

Page_____of______pages

Name________________________

ADDENDUM

(Minority reports, final words, and other thoughts)

PLAN NOTES

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON COOPERATIVE CAREER EDUCATION
PROGRAMMING FOR THE HANDICAPPED
March 15-18, 1977
University of Kentucky, Lexington

INSTITUTION____

PROGRAM TITLE______________________________________

____

I. Current Program Status: Please describe your present program for preparing and/or upgrading personnel to serve handicapped students in vocational settings. Include a description of program design, objectives and unique features.

II. Proposed Program Directions: Please describe your needs assessment activities and your projected plans for developing professional personnel in this field, including program objectives, design and unique characteristics.

III. Proposed Strategies: Please describe your proposed plan and strategies for reaching your objectives, including staff, facilities, community and/or agency involvement ("agency" includes governmental, educational, and philanthropic groups with which you plan to work).

APPENDIX C

CONFERENCE EVALUATION FORM

CONFERENCE EVALUATION

Name________________________________ Social Security Number____________________

I. Directions: Rate the following aspects of the conference as "adequate" or "inadequate" by circling one of the numbers displayed below. The higher the positive/negative number, the greater the degree of adequacy or inadequacy, respectively. Circle the appropriate rating and provide comments or suggestions when necessary.

Inadequate	Adequate			Comments/Suggestions
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(1)	Conference objectives clear	
-3 -2 -1	+ +2 +3	(2)	Conference objectives appropriate for needs	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(3)	Content appropriate for meeting states objectives	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(4)	Conference objectives were met	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(5)	Media appropriate for transmitting content	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(6)	Media technically sound	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(7)	Materials helpful to learning	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(8)	Conference staff helpful to learning	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(9)	Group sizes appropriate	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(10)	Group dynamics helpful to learning	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(11)	Conference evaluation procedures unobtrusive	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(12)	Overall content helpful professionally	
-3 -2 -1	+1 +2 +3	(13)	Overall pace of conference appropriate	

COMMENTS:

II. Rank order the eleven conference sessions or activities according to your preception of their contribution to the overall conference. Rank as #1 the activity or session that you feel was most worthwhile, #2 as next most worthwhile, and so on. Provide any additional comments and/or suggestions that might be helpful.

______Keynote address (Hoyt)

______The New Arena: Legislative Mandates and Legal Implications (Phelps and Chenoweth)

______Implications of the New Arena (Colello)

______IEP (Phillips and Ott)

______Providing Vocational Preparation for the Severely Multiply Handicapped (Gold)

______From There to Here (Team reports from the Illinois conferences)

______Workshop I

______Workshop II

______Workshop III

______Institutional Team Planning

______Reaction Groups

COMMENTS:

III. Check which optional sessions you attended. Did you feel these sessions to be worthwhile? Did you not attend other sessions because the content was already known or because you were not interested in the content? Provide comments or suggestions as desired.

Session	Session Attended	Was Session Worthwhile? (yes or no)	Did Not Attend: Session Content Already Known	Did Not Attend: Uninterested in Session
Film theatre	______	______	______	______
PL 94 - 142	______	______	______	______
Certification	______	______	______	______
Federal priorities	______	______	______	______

COMMENTS:

APPENDIX D

CONFERENCE EVALUATION COMMENTS

Employing the conference evaluation form, the participants were advised to offer comments and suggestions relative to the thirteen aspects. Also included was a section for overall general comments. On the following pages you will find the conference aspects and corresponding comments.

1.) Conference objectives clear:

   a) Conference objectives were clear.

   b) Objectives as presented needed no clarification.

   c) Team members conferred regarding conference objectives and had thorough understanding.

   d) Clear but felt too many individuals didn't read and follow through.

   e) The range of reference from where each participant was coming and the conference objectives seemed to lack real communication.

   f) Unfortunately some of the sub-part assignments were not.

   g) Need to emphasize.

   h) Vocabulary differences between states and sections of country made objectives unclear at first.

   i) Objectives were initially unclear.

   j) Perhaps a mailing of the program before the conference would serve some useful purpose to acquaint us with priorities.

   k) Misunderstood; thought that a University curriculum training personnel was needed.

   l) Would have preferred clear workshop outline goals and received same through the mail. The questions and issues received prior to the meeting offered thoughtful issues, however, they did not offer clear conference goals and anticipated payoff.

   m) Objectives were clear from the beginning.

   n) The conference goals and my goals were the same.

2.) Conference objectives appropriate for needs:

a) I suppose for most this was true.

b) An objective should have been to show model programs for kids.

c) More understanding of Special Educational, Vocational Education. What of place in Career Education for handicapped?

d) Seems some objectives were made with goals in mind of which conference attendees were unaware.

e) Much needed for Industrial Education.

3.) Content appropriate for meeting states objectives:

a) Groups adjusted for this.

b) Very erratic presentations.

c) Too much focus on MR-type handicapped individuals, not enough on others with their programming problems.

4.) Conference objectives were met:

a) I gained a great deal and met my objectives even more completely than I anticipated. Well worth the time.

b) As far as I'm concerned!

c) By individual assimilation, yes and this was good.

d) My objectives were met. I'm not sure if the staff's objectives were - since some of the requirements were more than can be completed in the time allocated.

e) Work-group settings - OK but work sheets limiting to elementary; covered ground already explained.

f) I needed more time to work on LKU plan.

g) This is hard to tell. It is up to individual teams to carry out their plans. The conference directors should not be held or judged on this item. Only time will tell. I feel it will be easier for my institution to meet the objectives now that I have attended the conference.

5.) Media appropriate for transmitting content:

a) Was very helpful - enjoyed the participants in this group, very open.

b) More audio visual.

c) Print of projected materials too small for size of this group.

d) Doug Evans deserves quite a lot of appreciation.

6.) Media technically sound:

a) At time "terms" meant different things to different people.

7.) Materials helpful to learning:

a) Nice handouts

b) Need more on competencies.

c) Handouts - things to digest over the months

d) Good materials from other schools.

e) Good material picked up from other sources.

f) Good handouts.

g) I'd selfishly like more "show and tell or share" than just "tell".

h) I would have liked to have more emphasis on curriculum content for the training programs.

8.) Conference staff helpful to learning:

a) Very well directed conference!

b) Very much so.

c) I had contact with only one, Bob Brock; would have liked more structured involvement with others from Kentucky University.

d) Excellent.

e) Could be more staff-participant interaction; could be more staff presentation.

9.) Group sizes appropriate:

a) Felt a responsibility to participate in the small groups.

b) Good.

c) Yes and then used sub-groups.

d) Small groups could have been a bit smaller.

e) I'd like even smaller ones.

f) Would have been good to address some issues as a whole.

10.) Group dynamics helpful to learning:

a) Both formally and informally.

b) Varied from group to group.

11.) Conference evaluation procedures unobtrusive:

a) Clear.

b) Should be anonymous.

c) Had a feeling you had the answers and we were to get there.

12.) Overall content helpful professionally:

a) Excellent.

b) Most helpful was group meeting Friday morning - meeting with others to discuss what they are doing and reactions received.

c) Would have liked to had input from businessmen and more info cooperation Vocational Education and Special Education in program.

d) Presentation generally weak.

e) Yes, things to refer back to awareness of different logistics.

13.) Overall pace of conference appropriate:

a) This seemed to be a strong point.

b) Not enough time to discuss programs informally.

c) Little rushed.

d) Maybe a little too rigorous. Nights should be left more open.

e) Small groups moved too rapidly.

f) Slow at first.

g) Too fast - needed more time, especially during work sessions; slow in the total group acitvity.

14.) General Comments:

a) I thought it was an excellent conference and all concerned are to be congratulated for a job well done - I'm sure we will see some great results.

b) Very good conference.

c) One great asset to give rapport and sincerity was the University of Kentucky staff and student workers. Always helpful, cheerful, pleasant, and made us feel welcome and even important. Thanks. Food and accommodations were excellent.

d) I needed this!

e) The organization of this conference was evident. All the Kentucky personnel were most helpful and gracious. Participants seeemed open and interested in multi-disciplinary efforts. The food/accommodations were great! Have another and make sure Texas A & M gets invited. Thank you.

f) Conference leaders were very gracious hosts, conference was a very enjoyable educational experience.

g) The conference was valuable. Change within each participant had to have taken place. Thank you for setting up the conference!

h) The conference did bring together highly competent personnel who shared ideas and institutional and state goals which enable me to get information on initiating efforts and the content of programs.

i) Well organized and planned very appropriate for my needs at this time.

j) This is my sixth conference. I'm not bragging or complaining, just stating a fact. And now, for another fact - this has been the best of the six. Thanks.

k) Thank you, I believe this was a good start for us in Pennsylvania to now do something.

l) Industrial arts people need a conference of this type. They will be working with many handicapped students in elementary and secondary schools. Many thanks - I needed this conference.

m) I regret that time commitments did not allow me to attend the first few sessions.

n) I came in not really knowing my own goals. This conference has helped me but I still have a lot to learn. Our team has a lot to do. Special Education and Vocational Education has a lot to do. I appreciate being invited here to learn.

o) Although the objectives for the conference did not seem systematic or clear - the interchange, interactions (bygroups, individuals) lead to divergent thinking, introspection, ie. The workshop assignment became an effective media even though the statements were not necessarily clear. Overall - Very Good.

p) I feel the greatest lack in the conference was that model programs for kids were not presented. What service delivery are we preparing people to give? There are model programs and they should be presented first. Then we can talk about preparation of personnel.

I feel the major strength of the conference was the people who came to the conference. They were a source of very valuable inter-change of information.

q) Pace good, would like to have had time to see area a little but a good working conference.

r) Small groups as a whole, were too rushed. Needed more time for interaction.

s) Too much sitting/lecturing during first part of conference. Great atmosphere and assistance from staff members and participants.

t) I would have preferred to have spent more time with my team member and two or three other complete teams discussing and formulating university wide plans of action-in terms of new courses that might be designed, etc. I would like to have seen some pre-conference competencies identified and then training sessions designed to acquire the competencies, for ex.--the IEP training was informative and directly applicable, yet was short-changed in time. I personally appreciated the homework assignment prior to the conference yet I didn't see that work utilized at the conference. Perhaps that assignment should have been part of the original proposal that was submitted and then the assumption could have been made that much of the work had been done in advance, and we could have built on that knowledge.

u) There also was a great emphasis on Vocational Education personnel, not enough Special Needs personnel.

v) Long sitting time in plastic chairs eventually tore me up.

w) I'm afraid to rate everything three - but the conference was planned and carried out to perfection.

x) Conference too narrow in scope. Broader issues not addressed, National, State and local priorities are the issue not definition or re-definition of roles of traditional job titles. Conference was well organized administratively. Good Job UK.

APPENDIX E

TEAM FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

TEAM FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE*

National Teacher Education Workshop on Career
Education Programming for the Handicapped:
Cooperative Personnel Preparation

Department of Special Education
Department of Vocational Education
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

INSTITUTION/CONSORTIUM:________________________

Team Members Attending Conference

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

______________________________ ______________________________

In order to determine the impact of the national workshop upon university personnel preparation programs concerning vocational programming for special needs students, it is important that all team members participate in filling out this questionnaire.

____

____

____

____

---

*Adapted from Follow-up Questionnaire, University of Illinois Workshop, 1976.

* For each of the items listed on the following pages, please (✓) one that best describes the action taken at your university(ies) in relation to career education programming for special education students.

Section A Course/Program Development Concerning Career Education Programming for Special Education Students	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary
1. Identification of teacher competencies for career education programming of secondary education students.	____	____	____	____	____	
2. Advisory/steering committee for course development	____	____	____	____	____	
3a. Proposal for introductory pre-service or inservice course.	____	____	____	____	____	
b. Presentation of proposal for introductory course to appropriate curriculum approving committee	____	____	____	____	____	
4a. Proposal for advanced (e.g., methods) course for preservice or inservice.	____	____	____	____	____	
b. Presentation of proposal for advanced course to appropriate curriculum approving committees.	____	____	____	____	____	

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessar
5. Procurement of resource materials for teaching courses/workshop	___	___	___	___	___	
6. Evaluation/revision of present courses or programs.	___	___	___	___	___	
7. Advisory/steering committee for degree program.	___	___	___	___	___	
8a. Development of proposal for undergraduate degree program.	___	___	___	___	___	
b. Submission of proposal for undergrad degree program for approval.	___	___	___	___	___	
9a. Development of proposal for graduate degree program.	___	___	___	___	___	
b. Submission of proposal for graduate degree program for approval.	___	___	___	___	___	
10a. Development and presentation of workshop (with objectives, corresponding materials, and so forth) concerning career education programming for special education students.	___	___	___	___	___	

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary

Section B

Staff to Implement Courses Program(s) (related to Career Education Programming for Special Education Students)

1. Present faculty competencies evaluated.						
2. Job description of position(s) desired						
3. Search committee(s) for position(s)						

Section C

Exploration of Funding Sources for Career Education Programming for Special Needs Students for:

						Local/ University	State	National
1. Inservice Workshops								
2. Research								
3. Curriculum development								
4. Planning committee meetings								

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary
Section D Communication/Cooperation Concerning Career Education Programming for Special Needs Students for Special Education Students						
1. Joint departmental/university meetings (sp ed/voc ed faculty invited)	____	____	____	____	____	

How many meetings have been held:

before workshop ____

since workshop ____

2. Joint departmental/university committees (sp ed/voc ed)

Please List Committees:

____

____

____

____

3. Other communication/cooperative activities:

Please List Activities:

____

____

____

	In Existence Prior to Workshop	In Planning Prior to Workshop	In Planning Since Workshop	Implemented/Completed Since Workshop	No Action Taken	Comment as necessary

Section E

a. What kind of progress are you making on your action plan, both short and long range?

b. What have been the major accomplishments?

c. What have been the major barriers?

d. Please list or describe the following activities in which you have participated since the University of Kentucky Conference:

____ Research
____ Publication
____ Course planning/development
____ Degree program planning/development
____ Proposal writing for funding
____ Planning of Inservice Workshop
Other: Please List.

e. List memberships in professional organization(s) concerned with career education programming for special needs students (NAVESNP, CEC, etc.)

	Name of Organization	Member before UK Conference	Member after UK Conference
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			

APPENDIX F

TEAM FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE COMMENTS

Utilizing the follow-up questionnaire, participant teams were advised to provide comments where appropriate relative to the various aspects of professional development in the area of cooperative personnel preparation. Subject components with corresponding comments are presented below.

Section A: Course/Program Development Concerning Career Education Programming for Special Education Students.

1.0) Identification of teacher competencies for career education programming of secondary education students.

  1.1) No comments provided.

2.0) Advisory/steering committee for course development.

  2.1) No comments provided.

3.0a) Proposal for introductory preservice or inservice course.

  3.1a) No comments provided.

3.0b) Presentation of proposal for introductory course to appropriate curriculum approving committee.

  3.1b) Courses are being offered at the present on an experimental basis.

  3.2b) Possibly components of existing courses.

  3.3b) Courses have been offered under a special topics number.

4.0a) Proposal for advanced (e.g., methods) course for preservice or inservice.

  4.1a) Although content has changed, a course in occupational education for the handicapped has been available since academic year 1965-66.

  4.2a) Courses have been offered under a special topics number.

4.0b) Presentation of proposal for advanced course to appropriate curriculum approving committees.

  4.1b) Grant proposal has been written.

4.2b) Yes, in concert with the mainstreaming movement.

4.3b) No action taken at the present.

5.0) Procurement of resource materials for teaching courses/workshop.

5.1) Yes, continuously.

5.2) Planning and updating is continuous.

6.0) Evaluation/revision of present courses or programs.

6.1) Constantly evaluated and revised to maintain relevancy.

7.0) Advisory/steering committee for degree program.

7.1) Presently in operation.

8.0a) Development of proposal for undergraduate degree program.

8.1a) Yes, in area of endorsement only.

8.0b) Submission of proposal for undergrad degree program for approval.

8.1b) Yes, in area of endorsement only.

9.0a) Development of proposal for graduate degree program.

9.1a) Yes, for area of endorsement only.

9.2a) Incorporated into existing program revisions.

9.0b) Submission of proposal for graduate degree program for approval.

9.1b) None.

10.0) Development and presentation of workshop (with objectives, corresponding materials, and so forth) concerning career education programming for special education students.

10.1) Yes, a pilot program

10.2) Yes, a two day conference supported by the state.

10.3) Yes, a workshop for personnel of the Education College.

Section B: Staff to implement courses program(s) (related to career education programming for special education students).

1.0) Present faculty competencies evaluated.

1.1) None.

2.0) Job description of position(s) desired.

2.1) None.

3.0) Search committee(s) for position(s).

3.1) Search committee for advancement of existing faculty.

3.2) Search committee is standing, however, no new staff will be sought this academic year.

3.3) Committee standing informally through contact with Dean and faculty of Education College.

3.4) Search committee not employed at the present.

Section C: Exploration of funding sources for career education programming for special needs students for:

1.0) Inservice workshops.

1.1) Inservice workshop conducted for teachers.

1.2) Inservice held under pilot program. Program submitted nationally as well as in-state.

2.0) Research.

2.1) Grant submitted.

2.2) Grant recently completed.

3.0) Curriculum development.

3.1) None.

4.0) Planning committee meetings.

4.1) Illinois has seven state universities that have organized to form the Illinois Secondary Handicapped Career Vocational Education Consortium.

Section D: Communication/cooperation concerning career education programming for special needs students for special education students.

1.0) Joint departmental/university meetings (sp ed/voc ed faculty invited):

a) in existence prior to workshop 7

b) in planning prior to workshop 4

c) in planning since workshop 7

d) implemented/completed since workshop 5

e) no action taken 6

How many meetings have been held:

a) prior to workshop 40

b) since workshop 61

1.1) Numerous joint meetings have been conducted on a continuous basis between the Departments of Special Education and Vocational Education.

1.2) Meetings have been conducted and interpreted as either working meetings of two or three faculty members, or committee meetings of both departments.

1.3) Faculty members from Special Education and Occupational Education have worked in concert on course proposals, resources, and programs of study for graduate students.

1.4) To date, entire faculties of departments have not met jointly. However, smaller segments of each department have met in joint-session.

2.0) Joint departmental/university committees (sp ed/voc ed) as listed:

2.1) Advisory Committee regarding Personnel Preparation in Vocational Education for Special Needs.

2.2) Mainstreaming Committee, College of Education.

2.3) Ad-Hoc Campus Advisory Committee for Vocational Education and Special Education.

2.4) Vocational Education, Guidance, and Counseling.

2.5) Special Education and Counseling.

2.6) College of Education Research Committee.

2.7) Special Needs Committee.

2.8) Special Education and Business Education.

2.9) Vocational Education and Special Education.

2.10) Counseling and Guidance with Career Education.

2.11) Career Education for the Handicapped Program Evaluation Committee.

2.12) Undergraduate Educational Psychology Committee for infusion of Special Education competencies for all teachers.

2.13) Planning Committee to evaluate effectiveness of cooperative Vocational Education and Special Education programs in terms of providing training.

3.0) Other communication/cooperative activities as listed:

3.1) Newsletter preparation.

3.2) Onsite courses for Vocational Education School.

3.3) Conference on the employment of the handicapped.

3.4) Job-seeking skills program.

3.5) Human Resources Development Committee.

3.6) Cooperative university-wide workshop.

3.7) Radio presentation.

3.8) More in-class units on career education.

3.9) Illinois Consortium in Career Education for the Handicapped.

3.10) Responding jointly to Texas Education Agency certification requirements.

3.11) Meetings with members of the faculties of the Departments of Special Education, Business Education, and Continuing Education.

3.12) State level joint committees.

3.13) Workshop for Coordinators of Secondary Career Education.

Section E: Other Actions

1.0) What kind of progress are you making on your action plan, both short and long range?

1.1) Excellent on short range dealing with course development and implementation.

1.2) Long range goals of providing Special/Vocational Needs in all state universities and undergraduate programs will require a greater time allotment.

1.3) Continuous planning.

1.4) Developed inservice training for regular classroom teachers, as well as for special classroom teachers.

1.5) Proposal written.

1.6) Cooperative courses are available.

1.7) Dialogue between Special Education and Vocational Education has increased greatly.

1.8) Cooperative course planning among departments has been implemented.

1.9) New certification plans have been completed and filed.

2.0) What have been the major accomplishments?

2.1) Implementation of state wide inservice.

2.2) Submission and approval of Vocational/Special Needs Curriculum.

2.3) An endorsement in Special/Vocational Needs for preservice and inservice.

2.4) Revising and implementing the dual certification program at the undergraduate level in Special/Vocational Education.

2.5) Implementation of a Graduate Specialist Program in Vocational Education-Special Needs.

2.6) State workshops on Employment of the Handicapped.

2.7) Establishment of the State Planning Committee.

2.8) Course development.

2.9) Cooperative effort among Departments of Special Education, Vocational Education, and Home Economics.

2.10) Pilot study in progress to develop rural area model.

2.11) Awareness of need to coordinate programs jointly.

2.12) Workshops have been planned.

3.0) What have been the major barriers?

3.1) Lack of funds commensurate with professional hours required.

3.2) Lack of facilitative assistance and approval from committees as required for change of university procedure.

3.3) Staff with training experience.

3.4) Career Education faculty are at a minimum.

3.5) People to acknowledge the need for career education.

3.6) Insufficient time for program development.

3.7) Poor interdisciplinary communication.

4.0) Please check and list or describe the following activities in which you have participated since the University of Kentucky Conference:

Research 6

4.1) Grant and proposal writing.

4.2) Committee formed.

4.3) Research being conducted to identify entry level competencies needed by handicapped students to enter regular vocational classes.

Publication 6

4.4) No comments provided.

Course planning/development 15

4.5) Participated in the development of the Illinois Consortium.

4.6) Development of auto-instructional modules.

4.7) Introduced unit on Vocational/Special Education in course required for Special Education majors.

Degree program planning/development 7

4.8) Certification efforts completed.

4.9) Have added Career Education for the Handdicapped to existing program.

Proposal writing for funding 16

4.10) Proposal writing is a continuous matter.

Planning of Inservice Workshop 13

4.11) Inservice activities for Vocational/Special educators throughout the state.

4.12) Proposal workshops have been conducted for public school administrators. The emphasis of these workshops has been relative to the benefits of Career Education for the Handicapped.

5.0) Memberships in professional organization(s) concerned with career education programming for special needs students (NAVESNP, CEC, etc.) as listed:

	Name of Organization	Member before UK Conference	Member after UK Conference
5.1)	Council for Exceptional Children	7	1
5.2)	Division for Career Development	2	1
5.3)	National Association for Career Education	1	0
5.4)	American Association on Mental Deficiency	2	1
5.5)	American Vocational Association	2	0
5.6)	National Association of Vocational Education-Special Needs Personnel	9	4
5.7)	Wisconsin Association of Vocational Education-Special Needs Personnel	1	0
5.8)	Pennsylvania Association of Vocational Education-Special Needs Personnel	0	1
5.9)	American Personnel and Guidance Association	0	1
5.10)	Minnesota Vocational Association	1	0
5.11)	National University Extension Association	1	0

	Name of Organization	Member before UK Conference	Member after UK Conference
5.12)	American Association of Colleges and State Universities	1	0
5.13)	National Business Education Association	1	0